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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is submitted to the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) for a Development Application (DA) under Part 4 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act).

The subject site, located on Hollinsworth Road, Marsden Park is legally described as Lots 23 and 24 DP262886 (the site). The site has a total area of approximately 214,805sqm and is located in the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct in the Blacktown Local Government Area (LGA).

This proposal comprises the redevelopment of the site for the purposes of a logistics and light industrial estate which will provide a range of distribution and warehousing and light industry facilities.

Site clearance and preparation, bulk earthworks, civil and essential infrastructure, stormwater management, site levels, subdivision and the construction of Hollinsworth Road shall be assessed and determined by Blacktown City Council under DA/275 (as modified). The proposed SSDA seeks consent for all buildings, hardstand, access roads, landscaping and connection to the approved infrastructure.

The proposal is defined as State Significant Development (SSD) pursuant to Schedule 1 Clause 12 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Major and Regional Development) 2011 as the proposed development has a total estimated capital investment value (CIV) of $128,763,128. The total CIV for Building 3 (Austcor) is $60,127,850 which meets the CIV threshold of Schedule 1.

PROPOSAL

This SSD application seeks approval for the development of a logistic and industrial estate, including:

- Construction of seven warehouse buildings with up to nine tenancies with ancillary office space;
- Construction of loading docks, hardstand and circulation areas, internal access roads, car-parking and landscaping works; and
- Service and infrastructure augmentation and additions.

CONSULTATION

Consultation has occurred with a range of key stakeholders and agencies during the preparation of this EIS, including:

- Local community,
- Blacktown City Council,
- Department of Planning and Environment,
- Roads and Maritime Services,
- BusWays, Sydney Business Park and Ingenia Static Homes.

Further discussion on the extent of consultation with the above stakeholders is provided in Section 1.7.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Secretary’s Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for the preparation of the EIS were issued on 4 August 2017. A copy of the SEARs is provided at Appendix A. Section 2 provides a summary of the SEARs and identifies where the relevant requirement is addressed and/or the appendix reference for the specialist consultant input associated with that requirement.

The SEARs identify the Key Issues to be addressed as part of an EIS, including:

- Strategic and Statutory Context
- Noise and Vibration
CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this EIS, the proposal supports the objectives and growth of the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct, providing employment opportunities and contributing to the growth of warehouse, logistics and general industrial related development in Blacktown LGA, Central City District and Western Sydney.

The proposal is suitable for the local context and will not result in any significant environmental impact. As such, it is recommended that the proposal be supported by DPE.
1. **INTRODUCTION**

This EIS has been prepared by Urbis on behalf of Logos Property and is submitted to the DPE pursuant to Part 4 of the EP&A Act in support of an application for SSD comprising the construction of an industrial estate at Lots 23 and 24 DP262886, Hollinsworth Road Marsden Park.

This EIS has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Part 4 of the EP&A Act, Schedule 2 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* (EP&A Regulation), and the SEARs.

1.1. **PROPOSAL OVERVIEW**

It is proposed to redevelop the site for an industrial estate which will provide a range of distribution and warehousing facilities. Key components of the proposal include:

- Construction and operation of seven warehouse buildings with up to nine tenancies with the following floor space:
  - Building 1A: 6,725sqm
  - Building 1B: 6,745sqm
  - Building 2A: 10,065sqm
  - Building 2B: 10,065sqm
  - Building 3 (Austcor): 39,443sqm
  - Building 4: 3,563sqm
  - Building 5 (Valley Fresh): 6,224sqm
  - Building 6: 12,140sqm
  - Building 7 (eStore): 12,802sqm
  - Total: 107,772sqm

- Ancillary office space for each respective warehouse;
- Loading docks, hardstand areas and internal access roads;
- 663 car-parking spaces;
- Service and infrastructure augmentation and additions; and
- Landscaping works.

1.2. **DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES**

The following objectives will assist the realisation of the Logos Marsden Park industrial project:

- Design and develop an industrial estate to capitalise on the site’s unique geographical and road network characteristics.
- Provide for employment opportunities within the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct.
- Provide opportunities for economic growth of the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct, surrounding region and the broader Blacktown LGA.
- To manage, minimise and mitigate the potential impacts of construction and operation of the proposal.
1.3. **LAND OWNERSHIP AND APPLICANT DETAILS**

The subject site is owned by Perpetual Corporate Trust Limited as trustee for LALV Marsden Park Trust. Logos Property is the applicant for the purposes of this SSDA.

Logos Property is an integrated property logistics specialist with expertise spanning all aspects of the risk return spectrum and an established network throughout the Asia Pacific region. Established in 2010, Logos initial major role was in managing a portfolio of assets. Logos Property have over 50 executives in our senior management teams operating from offices in Sydney, Shanghai and Singapore managing over $2 billion in assets across 21 locations for leading global real estate investors.

1.4. **CAPITAL INVESTMENT VALUE**

The total project Capital Investment Value (CIV), as defined under clause 3 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*, is $128,763,128.

The total CIV for Building 3 (Austcor) is $60,127,850.

A Quantity Surveyor Statement of cost prepared by Altus Group certifying the CIV of the proposed development is attached as Appendix B.

1.5. **PROJECT TEAM**

The following project team has been involved in the preparation of this application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Logos Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Logos Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Surveyor</td>
<td>Altus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Landpartners Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Watch This Space Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Associates Archaeology and Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Design</td>
<td>Geoscapes Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impact</td>
<td>Geoscapes Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Transport</td>
<td>GTA Consultants (NSW) Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Pacific Environment Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and Vibration</td>
<td>EMM Consulting Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushfire</td>
<td>Blackash Bushfire Consulting Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering – Stormwater</td>
<td>Costin Roe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td>Waste Audit and Consultancy Services Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Services</td>
<td>Landpartners Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# 1.6. DEVELOPMENT CONSENT OVERVIEW

A history of recent Development Applications on the subject site is detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Date of approval</th>
<th>Description of proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA15/275</td>
<td>9 September 2015</td>
<td>Subdivision to create of four Torrens title industrial lots, one lot for half width road construction of Hollinsworth Road, one lot for future bus-only link road and associated bulk earthworks and drainage infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA15/275 (s96(1))</td>
<td>23 June 2017</td>
<td>Correction of a minor error in the original consent which omitted a detailed civil plan which indicated level changes, drainage infrastructure, site clearance, tree removal and other civil engineering components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA15/275 (s96(2))</td>
<td>Under assessment</td>
<td>The proposal seeks to modify DA15-275, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of a temporary turning head on Lot 102 DP1188147,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Subdivision to create three Torrens title industrial lots, one lot for full width construction of Hollinsworth Road, and one lot for the future bus-only link road,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bulk earthworks and provision of retaining walls for the future industrial development,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Upgrade and construction of Hollinsworth Road including the full width construction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of infrastructure works including stormwater and essential services, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sediment control for the period from construction to future building developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The civil levels and infrastructure are to be assessed and approved under DA15/275 (as modified). The proposed SSDA seeks consent for all buildings, hardstand, access roads, landscaping and connection to the approved infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Proposal to relocate Hollinsworth Road</td>
<td>Pending lodgement</td>
<td>This Planning Proposal seeks to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Realign the SP2 Infrastructure (Local Road) zone (and the associated Land Reservation Acquisition) located on part Lot 24 DP262886 and part Lot 25 DP262886 (Ingenia site) approximately 12m south so that the entire SP2 zone is located on Lot 24. This will enable the full width road construction on Lot 24, although ‘roads’ are permissible on all zones on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Realign the SP2 zone on the adjoining lots to the west in order for the Hollinsworth Road extension to intersect with the future South Street extension at a right angle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This proposal does not seek to amend the existing permissible land uses or built form controls for the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.7. CONSULTATION

1.7.1. Council Consultation

The following provides an overview of consultation that has occurred with Blacktown City Council (Council) during the preparation of this EIS:

SEARs

Council were consulted during the preparation of the SEARs and the matters raised have generally been incorporated in the proposal.

Section 94s, Works-in-Kind and Land Dedication

The proponent has met on numerous occasions with Council to discuss the relevant developer contributions (levied under DA15/275), works-in-kind (WIK) (Hollinsworth Road construction and drainage infrastructure), and land dedication for the Hollinsworth Road extension. In summary:

- The Section 94 Contributions Plan No.21 Marsden Park Industrial Precinct” (2013) and the rates listed within DA15/275 apply.
- The WIK agreement will be formalised once DA15/275 (as modified) has been assessed and determined.
- The land dedication for Hollinsworth Road can occur once the Planning Proposal to relocate Hollinsworth is gazetted. This is because the Planning Proposal also seeks to relocate the associated Land Reservation Acquisition applicable to Hollinsworth Road.

Visual Impact Assessment Consultation

In accordance with the SEARs, on 20 September 2017 the proponent provided council with all key vantage points (VP) for the visual impact assessment of the site from the surrounding areas. The assessment methodology focussed on the existing residential suburb to the south as this area is considered an important sensitive receiver. Council’s City Architect [MC-17-00001 SSD 8606 Hollinsworth Rd, MARSDEN PARK - Visual Impact Assessment – dated 21 September 2017] responded with the following comment:

*Given that the application is for a development adjacent to residential properties, I would suggest that there would be additional key vantage points from within the neighbouring properties and not just from the street. The impact of the development will be ‘felt’ by the residents more so from within their properties, than the street - particularly their rear yards. Two additional VP's would be useful further east and west of VP3.*

*I appreciate that these images are just the first draft, but I would expect to see either accurate photomontages of the existing dwellings or the existing dwellings modelled in 3d. As currently presented the images are inaccurate as the built form is not represented in 3d.*

Access to the neighbouring properties was restricted as the proponent does not have ownership on them, however the base photography was taken from the back fence and as such provides an accurate representation of the perceivable impact. Refer to the Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix L.

1.7.2. Community Consultation

Urbis was engaged by Logos Property to undertake community consultation to inform the development of the application. This report documents the consultation process, community feedback, and considerations in response to community feedback.

Community consultation was undertaken over 4 weeks in September and October 2017. Consultation activities included:

- Distribution of a letter and project factsheet to 800 households informing the SSDA, key features of the proposal, community information and feedback sessions and contact details for further information
- Distribution of email to relevant (Ward 5) Blacktown City Councillors
- Two Community Information and Feedback Sessions (two hours each) attended by 11 people
- Formal feedback forms available at the Community Information and Feedback Sessions
Communication channels including a dedicated project email and 1800 phone number

Feedback received during the consultation process was generally accepting of the proposed development for light industrial purposes and for the extension of Hollinsworth Road. Most community members were aware of the industrial zoning on the subject site and broader Marsden Park Industrial Precinct.

Some concerns were raised regarding the operation of the proposal development, including noise, odour and operating hours. There were also a number of comments regarding existing traffic congestion in the local area and how this will be impacted or could be improved.

Key themes raised in the feedback received includes:

- Noise generated from trucks entering and exiting the site and distance between the site and existing Caravan Park
- 24 hour operation of the distribution and warehousing facilities
- Worsening traffic congestion on Hollinsworth Road, Rooty Hill Road and Richmond Road
- Support for Hollinsworth Road extension and South Street connection
- Potential odour emitted from the future distribution and warehouse facilities

All community feedback received during the consultation process has been summarised at the Community Consultation Outcomes Report (Appendix R).
2. **APPROVAL FRAMEWORK**

The EIS supports a DA under Part 4 of the EP&A Act for the proposed development.

A request was made to the Minister pursuant to Clause 3, Schedule 2 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* for the SEARs in relation to the proposed development. The request for SEARs was made on 5 July 2017. SEARs were issued on 4 August 2017.

The SEARs informed the relevant matters to be addressed within this EIS. A complete copy of the SEARs has been included at Appendix A.

The relevant section or document that addresses the relevant requirement is also identified within Table 3.

**Table 3 – Secretary’s Environmental Assessment Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/Description</th>
<th>Document Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the development must meet the form</td>
<td>Clause 6 Statement of Validity and throughout EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and content requirements in clauses 6 and 7 of Schedule 2 of the <em>Environmental</em></td>
<td>Clause 7; throughout EIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 (the Regulation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, the EIS must include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a detailed description of the development, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– the need for the proposed development;</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– justification for the proposed development;</td>
<td>Section 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a description of feasible options within the development which may include a</td>
<td>Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>layout options analysis;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– likely staging of the development;</td>
<td>Section 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– likely interactions between the development and existing, approved and</td>
<td>Section 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed operations in the vicinity of the site; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– plans of any proposed building works.</td>
<td>Appendix D; Appendix E; Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• consideration of all relevant environmental planning instruments, including</td>
<td>Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification and justification of any inconsistencies with these instruments;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a risk assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the development,</td>
<td>Section 7 and in assessment reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identifying the key issues for further assessment;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a detailed assessment of the key issues specified below, and any other significant</td>
<td>Section 6 and in assessment reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues identified in this risk assessment, which includes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a description of the existing environment, using sufficient baseline data;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– an assessment of the potential impacts of all stages of the development,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including any cumulative impacts, taking into consideration relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidelines, policies, plans and statutes; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a description of the measures that would be implemented to avoid, minimise,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigate and if necessary, offset the potential impacts of the development,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including proposals for adaptive management and/or contingency plans to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage significant risks to the environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item/ Description</td>
<td>Document Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EIS must also be accompanied by a report from a qualified quantity surveyor</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>providing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a detailed calculation of the capital investment value (CIV) of the development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as defined in clause 3 of the Regulation, including details of all components of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the CIV;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• an estimate of the jobs that will be created by the development during the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction and operational phases of the development; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• certification the information provided is accurate at the date of preparation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Issues**

The EIS must address the following specific matters:

- **Strategic and Statutory Context**
  - detailed justification for the proposal and the suitability of the site; and
  - a demonstration the proposal is generally consistent with all relevant planning strategies, environmental planning instruments, development control plans (DCPs), precinct plans and draft district plans.

- **Urban Design and Visual**
  - layout of the development including staging, floor space ratio, fencing, lighting, site coverage, building, hardstand, setbacks, proposed open space and landscaped areas for the overall development and for individual warehouse buildings;
  - detailed justification and analysis for the proposed high bay component, including a written request under clause 4.6 of the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct Plan within *State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006* for the exception to the height of buildings development standard applying to the site;
  - details of the design choices of the development layout and finishes, including consideration of alternatives to minimise and/or mitigate visual impacts;
  - suitable landscaping incorporating locally native species;
  - a detailed assessment (including photomontages and perspectives) of the proposal (buildings and storage areas) including height, colour, scale, bulk, building materials and architectural treatments and finishes, signage, lighting and any retaining walls particularly from nearby public receivers and significant vantage points within the broader public domain including evidence of consultation with Council; and
  - the layout and design of the development having regard to the surrounding vehicular, pedestrian and cycling networks, if applicable.

- **Traffic and Transport**
  - a quantitative Traffic Impact Assessment prepared in accordance with the relevant Council, Austroads and Roads and Maritime Services guidelines;
  - details of all daily and peak traffic and transport movements likely to be generated by the development (vehicle type, public transport, pedestrian and cycle trips) during construction and operation;
  - details of road transport routes and access to the site, including intersection location, design and sight distance;
  - a cumulative assessment of the predicted impacts on road safety and the capacity of the road network to accommodate the development including existing and future performance of nearby key intersections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/ Description</th>
<th>Document Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- consideration of traffic volumes from the proposal together with existing and approved developments in the area using SIDRA or a similar model;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed Castlereagh Freeway road reserve along the southern boundary of the site;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- details of any road upgrades or new roads required for the development, if necessary;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- details of vehicle circulation of the largest light and heavy vehicle anticipated to access the site, including swept path analysis, loading dock servicing and provisions;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- detailed plans of the internal road network and parking provision on-site in accordance with the relevant Australian Standards;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- details of any likely dangerous goods to be transported on arterial and local roads to/from the site, if any, and the preparation of an incident management strategy, if necessary; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- details of bicycle parking and end of trip facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Soils and Water
  - a description of the water demands, servicing arrangements and a breakdown of water supplies;
  - a description of the measures to minimise water use;
  - a description of the proposed erosion and sediment controls during construction and operation;
  - a detailed assessment of potential soil (including contamination and acid sulphate soil), surface water, groundwater and salinity impacts of the proposed development, including adequate mitigating and monitoring measures;
  - a description of the surface and stormwater management system, including on-site detention, and measures to treat or re-use water;
  - an assessment of potential surface and groundwater impacts associated with the development;
  - details of Water Sensitive Urban Design measures to be implemented;
  - an assessment of the impact of flooding on the proposed development for the full range of flood events up to the probable maximum flood;
  - an assessment of the impact of the proposed development on flood behaviour and drainage patterns; and
  - details of impact mitigation, management and monitoring measures.

- Noise and Vibration
  - a description of all potential noise and vibration sources during the construction and operational phases of the development, including on and off-site traffic noise and external mechanical plant;
  - a quantitative noise impact assessment, including a cumulative noise impact assessment in accordance with relevant Environment Protection Authority guidelines; and
  - details of noise mitigation, management and monitoring measures.

- Hazards and Risk
  - if the storage of dangerous goods is proposed on-site, the EIS must include a preliminary risk screening completed in accordance with State Environmental Planning Policy No. 33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development and

Section 6.5 and Appendix F

Section 6.6 and Appendix G

Section 6.7 and Appendix V
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item/ Description</th>
<th>Document Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applying SEPP 33 (DoP, 2011), with a clear indication of class, quantity and location of all dangerous goods and hazardous materials associated with the development. Should preliminary screening indicate that the project is “potentially hazardous” a preliminary hazard analysis (PHA) must be prepared in accordance with Hazardous Industry Planning Advisory Paper No. 6 – Guidelines for Hazard Analysis (DoP, 2011) and Multi-Level Risk Assessment (DoP, 2011).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Section 6.9 and Appendix I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– an assessment of the air quality impacts (particularity dust) at private properties during construction and operation of the development, in accordance with the relevant Environment Protection Authority guidelines; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– details of any mitigation, management and monitoring measures required to prevent and/or minimise emissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Requirements</td>
<td>Section 6.10 and Appendix Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a detailed description of existing infrastructure on-site;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– identification of any infrastructure upgrades required to facilitate the development;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a description of any arrangements to ensure the required upgrades will be implemented in a timely manner and maintained; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– details of any works proposed near or within the TransGrid Sydney West – Sydney North No. 1 330 KV transmission line easement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushfire</td>
<td>Section 6.11 and Appendix J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– details of how the proposal addresses the requirements of the Draft Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2017 (RFS) and the provision of access (including perimeter roads) and provision of water supply for firefighting purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>Section 6.9; Appendix M; Appendix N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– details of the quantities and classification of all waste streams to be generated on site;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– a description of all wastewater generated on-site;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– details of waste storage, handling and disposal; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– details of the measures that would be implemented to ensure that the development is consistent with the aims, objectives and guidance in the NSW Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Strategy 2014-2021.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Section 6.13 Appendix O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– including an Aboriginal heritage assessment in accordance with OEH guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and Documents</td>
<td>Appendix D, Appendix E, Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EIS must include all relevant plans, architectural drawings, diagrams and relevant documentation required under Schedule 1 of the Regulation. These documents should be provided as part of the EIS rather than as separate documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Section 1.7 and Appendix R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the preparation of the EIS, you must consult with the relevant local, State or Commonwealth Government authorities, service providers, community groups and affected landowners. In particular, you must consult with:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Blacktown City Council;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The EIS must describe the consultation process and the issues raised, and identify where the design of the development has been amended in response to these issues. Where amendments have not been made to address an issue, a short explanation should be provided.

The following table provides a response to the separate agency comments appended to the SEARs.

Table 4 – Agency Comments Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Document Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EPA</strong></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal does not constitute a Scheduled Activity under Schedule 1 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act). The EPA does not consider that the proposal will require an Environmental Protection Licence under the POEO Act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RMS**

1. Daily and peak traffic movements likely to be generated by the proposed development including the impact on nearby intersections and the need/associated funding for upgrading or road improvement works (if required). The key intersection to be examined / modelled includes:
   - Richmond Road/Hollinsworth Road/Townson Road.

2. Details of the proposed site access and the parking provisions associated with the proposed development including compliance with the requirements of the relevant Australian Standards (ie: turn paths, sight distance requirements, aisle widths, etc).

3. Detailing vehicle circulation, proposed number of car parking spaces and compliance with the appropriate parking codes.

1. Table 6.1 of the Traffic Impact Assessment (Appendix H) indicates by adopting generic traffic generation rates, the proposed estate is anticipated to generate 561 and 603 vehicle movements in the AM and PM peak hours respectively and 4,958 movements daily. Refer to Section 6.3 of the Traffic Impact Assessment (Appendix H) provides an assessment of the Richmond Road/Hollinsworth Road/Townson Road intersection.

2. Site access is assessed at Section 5.2 of the Traffic Impact Assessment. Parking provision is assessed at Section 4 of the Traffic Impact Assessment.
### Comment

4. Details of light and heavy vehicle movements (including vehicle type and likely arrival and departure times).

5. To ensure that the above requirements are fully addressed, the transport and traffic study must properly ascertain the cumulative study area traffic impacts associated with the development (and any other known proposed developments in the area). This process provides an opportunity to identify a package of traffic and transport infrastructure measures required to support future development. Regional and local intersection and road improvements, vehicular access options for adjoining sites, public transport needs, the timing and cost of infrastructure works and the identification of funding responsibilities associated with the development should be identified.

6. Roads and Maritime will require in due course the provision of a traffic management plan for all demolition/construction activities, detailing vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control measures.

7. A strip of land has previously been acquired for road (proposed Castlereagh Freeway) along the southern boundary of the subject property, as shown by blue colour on the attached Aerial – “X”. Access will be denied across the southern boundary of the property to the proposed Castlereagh Freeway corridor.

All buildings and structures, together with any improvements integral to the future use of the site are wholly within the freehold property (unlimited in height or depth), along the southern boundary of the subject property.

8. This application should be referred to Transport for NSW regarding a proposed bus-only and active transport through-route on the Future Bus Link Reserve.

### Response

3. Refer to at Section 5.2 of the Traffic Impact Assessment.

4. Refer to at Section 6 of the Traffic Impact Assessment.

5. Refer to at Section 6 of the Traffic Impact Assessment.

6. TMP requested to be a condition of consent.

7. Noted.


### Office of Environment and Heritage

- The EIS must identify and describe the Aboriginal cultural heritage (ACH) values that exist across the whole area that will be affected by the development and document these in the EIS. This may include the need for surface survey and test excavation. The identification of ACH values

The Aboriginal Heritage Assessment Report finds:

- Most of the study area has nil-low artefact density defined in the report as ‘Sparse Lithic Sites’. However, there is also a definable area of moderate

| Appendix O | and Appendix P |
should be guided by the Guide to investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal Cultural Heritage in NSW (DECCW, 2011) and consultation with OEH regional officers.

- Where ACH values are identified, consultation with Aboriginal people must be undertaken and documented in accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (DECCW). The significance of cultural heritage values for Aboriginal people who have a cultural association with the land must be documented in the EIS.

- Impacts on Aboriginal cultural heritage values are to be assessed and documented in the EIS. The EIS must demonstrate attempts to avoid impact upon cultural heritage values and identify any conservation outcomes. Where impacts are unavoidable, the EIS must outline measures proposed to mitigate impacts. Any objects recorded as part of the assessment must be documented and notified to OEH.

- Density archaeological potential associated with the single discrete hill top in the study area described as a ‘Dispersed Lithic Site’. The areas of Sparse Lithic Sites are considered to have low archaeological significance, while the ‘Dispersed Lithic Site’ is of moderate significance.

- Feedback was sought in response to a draft iteration of this report. The major contribution, provided by DCAC included the statements that:
  
  “This area is significant to the Darug people due to the evidence of continued occupation, within close proximity to this project site there is a complex of significant sites”.

  Other comments related to ongoing frustrations with the consultation process in western Sydney but otherwise noted that “We support the recommendations set out in this report”.

- An Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit is included at Appendix O.

**Floodplain Risk Management, Soils and Water**

The EIS must map the following features relevant to water and soils including:

1. Acid sulfate soils (Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 on the Acid Sulfate Soil Planning Map).
2. Rivers, streams and wetlands.
4. Groundwater dependent ecosystems.
5. Proposed intake and discharge locations.

The EIS must describe background conditions for any water resource likely to be affected by the development, including:

1. Existing surface and groundwater.

1. Refer to Section 4.1 of the Contamination Report (Appendix K).
2. Refer to Section 4.1 of Appendix K.
3. Refer to Section 3.2 of the Contamination Report (Appendix K) which confirms that groundwater was not encountered during the course of the investigation.
4. All ecological impacts was assessed and approved during the subdivision and civil works DA (DA15/275).

1. Refer to Section 3.2 of the Contamination Report (Appendix K) which confirms that groundwater was not encountered during the course of the investigation.

Appendix K; Appendix F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Document Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Hydrology, including volume, frequency and quality of discharges at proposed intake and discharge locations.</td>
<td>2. Refer to Section 4.1 of the Civil Report (Appendix F).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Water Quality Objectives including groundwater as appropriate that represent the community's uses and values for the receiving waters.</td>
<td>3. Refer to Section 6.1 of the Civil Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indicators and trigger values/criteria for the environmental values identified at (c) in accordance with the ANZECC (2000) Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality and/or local objectives, criteria or targets endorsed by the NSW Government.</td>
<td>4. Refer to Section 5 of the Civil Report which details consistency with Blacktown City Council’s water quality requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EIS must assess the impacts of the development on water quality, including:</td>
<td>1. Refer to Section 6.1 and 6.2 of the Civil Report (Appendix F).</td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The nature and degree of impact on receiving waters for both surface and groundwater, demonstrating how the development protects the Water Quality Objectives where they are currently being achieved, and contributes towards achievement of the Water Quality Objectives over time where they are currently not being achieved. This should include an assessment of the mitigating effects of proposed stormwater and wastewater management during and after construction.</td>
<td>2. Refer to Section 6.6 of the Civil Report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identification of proposed monitoring of water quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EIS must assess the impact of the development on hydrology, including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Water balance including quantity, quality and source.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effects to downstream rivers, wetlands, estuaries, marine waters and floodplain areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Effects to downstream water-dependent fauna and flora including groundwater dependent ecosystems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impacts to natural processes and functions within rivers, wetlands, estuaries and floodplains that affect river system and landscape health such as nutrient flow, aquatic connectivity and access to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subdivision and civil works DA assessed and approved (DA-15-275) impacts on hydrology systems surrounding the site. Refer to Section 5 of the Civil Report which details impacts and mitigation measures for stormwater quantity, quality, erosion and sediment control.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Document Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habitat for spawning and refuge (e.g. river benches).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Changes to environmental water availability, both regulated/licensed and unregulated/rules-based sources of such water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mitigating effects of proposed stormwater and wastewater management during and after construction on hydrological attributes such as volumes, flow rates, management methods and re-use options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Identification of proposed monitoring of hydrological attributes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EIS must map the following features relevant to flooding as described in the Floodplain Development Manual 2005 (NSW Government 2005) including:</td>
<td>Costin Roe have confirmed that the site is not affected by flooding, other than the overland flow from the catchment. Refer to Costin Roe Section 96(2) Co12829.06-DA series drawings in Appendix B (of Appendix F) for details.</td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flood prone land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flood planning area, the area below the flood planning level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hydraulic categorisation (floodways and flood storage areas).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EIS must describe flood assessment and modelling undertaken in determining the design flood levels for events, including a minimum of the 1 in 10 year, 1 in 100 year flood levels and the probable maximum flood, or an equivalent extreme event.</td>
<td>Costin Roe confirm the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The design of the stormwater system for this site will be based on relevant national design guidelines, Australian Standard Codes of Practice, Blacktown City Council and accepted engineering practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically, the design will be based on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Runoff from buildings will generally be designed in accordance with AS 3500.3 National Plumbing and Drainage Code Part 3 – Stormwater Drainage;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overall site runoff and stormwater management will generally be designed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The EIS must model the effect of the proposed development (including fill) on the flood behaviour under the following scenarios:

- Current flood behaviour for a range of design events as identified above. This includes the 1 in 200 and 1 in 500 year flood events as proxies for assessing sensitivity to an increase in rainfall intensity of flood producing rainfall events due to climate change.

Modelling in the EIS must consider and document:

- The impact on existing flood behaviour for a full range of flood events including up to the probable maximum flood.
- Impacts of the development on flood behaviour resulting in detrimental changes in potential flood affection of other developments or land. This may include redirection of flow, flow velocities, flood levels, hazards and hydraulic categories.

Costin Roe have confirmed that “The site is not affected by flooding, other than the overland flow which is currently conveyed through the western side of Lot 23 along an existing gully and through an existing dam prior to discharge from the property to the north. The upstream catchment (approximately 5.3 Ha) will need to be conveyed through the site within a pipe and dedicated easement. This is currently under being processed under a separate approval with Blacktown City Council, DA 15-275.

This flow from the upstream catchment is to be design to bypass all future site detention (OSD) measures and water quality devices”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Document Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in accordance with the Institution of Engineers, Australia publication “Australian Rainfall and Runoff” (1987 Edition), Volumes 1 and 2 (AR&amp;R) – It is noted that a design principle is not yet in place for on-site detention systems using AR&amp;R 2016 data;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Blacktown City Council’s Engineering Guidelines for Development 2005;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Storm events for the 2 to 100 Year ARI event have been assessed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainfall intensity Frequency Duration (IFD) data used as a basis for ILSAX and RAFTS modelling for the 2 to 100 Year ARI events, was taken from Blacktown City Council’s Engineering Guidelines for Development 2005.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydraulic calculations will be carried out utilising DRAINS modelling software during the detail design stage to ensure that all surface and subsurface drainage systems perform to or exceed the required standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not affected by flooding, other than the overland flow which is currently conveyed through the western side of Lot 23 along an existing gully and through an existing dam prior to discharge from the property to the north. The upstream catchment (approximately 5.3 Ha) will need to be conveyed through the site within a pipe and dedicated easement. This is currently under being processed under a separate approval with Blacktown City Council, DA 15-275.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This flow from the upstream catchment is to be design to bypass all future site detention (OSD) measures and water quality devices”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The EIS must assess the impacts on the proposed development on flood behaviour, including:

- Whether there will be detrimental increases in the potential flood affectation of other properties, assets and infrastructure.
- Consistency with Blacktown City Council (BCC) floodplain risk management plans.
- Compatibility with the flood hazard of the land.
- Compatibility with the hydraulic functions of flow conveyance in floodways and storage in flood storage areas of the land.
- Whether there will be adverse effect to beneficial inundation of the floodplain environment, on, adjacent to or downstream of the site.
- Whether there will be direct or indirect increase in erosion, siltation, destruction of riparian vegetation or a reduction in the stability of river banks or watercourses.
- Any impacts the development may have upon existing community emergency management arrangements for flooding. These matters are to be discussed with the SES and BCC.
- Whether the proposal incorporates specific measures to manage risk to life from flood. These matters are to be discussed with the SES and BCC.
- Emergency management, evacuation and access, and contingency measures for the development considering the full range or flood risk (based upon the probable maximum flood or an equivalent extreme flood event). These matters are to be discussed with and have the support of BCC and the SES.
- Any impacts the development may have on the social and economic costs to the community as consequence of flooding.

For all areas subject to pedestrian traffic, the product (dV) of the depth of flow d (in metres) and the velocity of flow V (in metres per second) will be limited to 0.4, for all storms up to the 100-year ARI.

For other areas, the dV product will be limited to 0.6 for stability of vehicular traffic (whether parked or in motion) for all storms up to the 100-year ARI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant provisions of the NSW Floodplain Development Manual 2005.</td>
<td>For all areas subject to pedestrian traffic, the product (dV) of the depth of flow d (in metres) and the velocity of flow V (in metres per second) will be limited to 0.4, for all storms up to the 100-year ARI. For other areas, the dV product will be limited to 0.6 for stability of vehicular traffic (whether parked or in motion) for all storms up to the 100-year ARI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Document Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of consent recommendation.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry NSW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Geological Survey of New South Wales has no resource issues to raise in regard to the proposal and has no SEARs to issue for this proposal.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TransGrid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransGrid requests that the following matters be included in the SEARs:</td>
<td>1. The TransGrid easement and assets are detailed in Section 3.2 of this EIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. All works proposed as part of the SSDA are located outside of the TransGrid easement. The northwest corner of Lot 24 is approx. 40m south of the easement. No impacts are expected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. TransGrid will be provided with the SSDA for comment during exhibition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Clause 45(1)(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Details of TransGrid's assets and easement in the section 'surrounding development';</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Impacts of the proposal on TransGrid's assets;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. TransGrid should be identified in the consultation plan as a key stakeholder; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <em>State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure)</em> 2007 should be included in the section 'statutory planning framework'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport for NSW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The suggested additions and changes to the SEARs are provided in track changes in the attached draft SEARs for the above development application.</td>
<td>Table 3 provides a response to the SEARs.</td>
<td>Table 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Primary Industries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI recommends the Environmental Impact Statement address the following:</td>
<td>The Proponent is currently assessing the volumetric water licensing requirements. Refer to Section 5 of the Civil Report for an assessment of the quality and quantity impacts and mitigation measures related to the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Assessment of any volumetric water licensing requirements (including those for ongoing water take following completion of construction).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Assessment of impacts on surface and ground water sources (both quality and quantity), related infrastructure, adjacent licensed water users, basic landholder rights, watercourses, riparian land, and groundwater dependent ecosystems, and measures proposed to reduce and mitigate these impacts.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Consideration of relevant legislation, policies and guidelines, including the NSW Aquifer Interference Policy, the DPI Water Guidelines for Controlled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities on Waterfront Land and the Water Sharing Plans for the Greater Metropolitan Region Groundwater Sources and Unregulated River Water Sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Blacktown City Council**

### Planning Matters

- Final plans submitted shall ensure that the lot layout will be consistent with the revised subdivision boundaries and dimensions.
- Under State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006, Hollinsworth Road is zoned as SP2 Local Road. It is recommended that this proposal shall not be determined prior to gazettal of the planning proposal.
- Future bus link reserve shown on the plans shall be constructed by the developer as this section of road reserve is not subject to a Section 94 road.
- Consider the development site is within close proximity to Oakhurst residential area and to the caravan park estate across the road, proposed Building 3’s 30m high-bay area raises issues of visual impact and architectural merit that the NewCold raised. It is required that a Clause 4.6 variation be submitted and considered. The Clause 4.6 variation shall justify why it is in the public interest to allow the high bay and what is the better planning outcome of allowing the high bay to exceed the height limit.
- Applicant to provide landscaping strategy to screen the development from residential uses across the road and into Oakhurst.
- Proposed access roads in the form of cul-de-sac is to remain as private road. Council will not accept dedication of these roads.
- The proposal is deemed premature and could change given the new development application to relocate the full width of Hollinsworth Road and final design of the roundabout is yet to be determined.

### Planning Matters

- The architectural and civil drawings are based on the current civil and subdivision drawings under assessment by Council under DA15/275.
- The Planning Proposal to amend the location of the SP2 zone is being prepared in consultation with Council.
- Noted re future bus link.
- This SSDA includes a comprehensive Visual Impact Assessment with viewpoints established in consultation with Council’s City Architect. A Clause 4.6 variation request can be found at Appendix S.
- Refer to the Landscape Drawings and Report at Appendix E which detail the screening strategy at various sensitive receivers surrounding the site.
- All internal roads will be kept under private ownership.
- Pre-lodgement consultation has resolved Council’s concern regarding the SSDA being premature. A Section 96 has been lodged with Council which seeks consent for the road realignment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Document Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage and Engineering</strong></td>
<td><strong>Drainage and Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance with Blacktown City Council Priority Growth Area Precincts Development Control Plan particularly Schedule 3 for the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct.</td>
<td>• The Civil Engineering Report prepared by Costin Roe (Appendix F) details compliance with the DCP and Council policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compliance with any applicable requirement s by Blacktown City Council's Engineering Guide for Development and Construction Specification.</td>
<td>• All works proposed under this SSDA are contained within Lots 23 and 24. Owners consent of these lots has been provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Owners consent shall be required for any works on adjoining properties.</td>
<td>• Refer to Section 5 of The Civil Engineering Report prepared by Costin Roe (Appendix F) for water quality information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permeant water quality treatment on lots shall be provided.</td>
<td>• Costin Roe prepared the Civil Drawings for this SSDA and DA15/275 (as proposed to be amended). The stormwater concept is consistent and contains:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stormwater management plan shall be prepared consistent with that prepared for the approved subdivision application (DA-15-00275) and must include:</td>
<td>- Stormwater treatment (refer to Section 6.2 in Appendix F),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include permanent on-lot stormwater treatment and management complying with DCP, precinct planning stormwater management strategy and adopted Section 94 Contribution Plan requirements.</td>
<td>- Consideration of upstream impacts (refer to Section 4.4 in Appendix F), and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safely convey upstream catchment flows through the site up to and including the 100 year ARI design flows.</td>
<td>- Stormwater detention (refer to Section 5 in Appendix F),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide temporary detention storage to limit post development flows to predevelopment flows for all flows up to and including the 100 year ARI design flows at each existing site discharge point and consistent with precinct planning stormwater management strategy and adopted Section 94 Contribution Plan.</td>
<td><strong>Environmental Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Health</strong></td>
<td>• Refer to the Contamination Report at Appendix K prepared by Ground Technologies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A site contamination assessment shall be completed and a validation report shall be prepared to ensure that the site is suitable for its intended use. The validation report shall be prepared by an EPA recognised geoscientist in accordance with the strict criteria set out in the National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure (NEPM) 1999 as amended 2013.</td>
<td>• Refer to the Acoustic Report at Appendix G prepared by EMM which assesses the noise impacts of 24 hour operation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Document Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An acoustic report shall accompany the application given its close proximity to residential uses. The report needs to address noise attenuation for 24 hour truck operations on the sleep disturbance criteria of the residents between 10pm and 7am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RFS</strong></td>
<td>Black Ash have provided an assessment against the aims and objectives of Planning for Bush fire Protection 2006.</td>
<td>Appendix J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based upon an assessment of the information provided, the NSW RFS advises that the aims and objectives of Planning for Bush fire Protection 2006 should be considered in the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydney Water</strong></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Appendix Q for Infrastructure Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Land Partners provide the following in response to Sydney Water:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The proponent should demonstrate demands and satisfactory servicing arrangements for drinking water, wastewater and recycled water (if required).</td>
<td><strong>Potable Water</strong> - A recently constructed 200mm water main is struc[ sic] in Hollinsworth Road approximately 30m to the east of the subject site. This main will be extended to provide potable water reticulation services to the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The proponent must gain approval from Sydney Water to ensure that the proposed development does not adversely impact on any existing water, wastewater or stormwater main, or Sydney Water asset, easement or property. When determining landscaping options, the proponent should take into account that certain tree species can cause cracking or blockage of Sydney Water pipes and therefore should be avoided.</td>
<td><strong>Waste Water</strong> - Existing Sydney water sewer mains are constructed in the Sydney Business Park development area. The nearest main available for connection is approximately 450m to the east of the site near the intersection of Harris Street and Hollinsworth Rd. Extension of this main from the downstream connection point will be required to service the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strict requirements for Sydney Water's stormwater assets for certain types of development may apply. The proponent should ensure satisfactory stormwater assets protection, building over and/or adjacent to stormwater assets, building bridges over stormwater assets, potential flood, water quality, heritage impacts and creation of easements.</td>
<td><strong>Sydney Water Requirements</strong> - Sydney Water through its Sec 73 processes will outline the requirements to service the development. Sydney Water will become the owner of the utility assets which will be delivered at the cost of the developer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Water Cycle Management</strong></td>
<td>Costin Roe have incorporating the principles of Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of water sensitive urban design and any proposed water conservation measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and to target pollutants that are present in the stormwater so as to minimise the adverse impact these pollutants could have on receiving waters and to also meet the requirements specified by the Blacktown City Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. SITE AND LOCALITY

3.1. SITE

A descriptive overview of the site is provided in Table 5 below and an aerial photo of the site is provided at Figure 1.

Table 5 – Site Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Hollinsworth Road, Marsden Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Area</td>
<td>Blacktown City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal description</td>
<td>Lot 23 &amp; Lot 24 DP262886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site area</td>
<td>214,805sqm (20.3ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>The site is located in the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct, 40 kilometres’ northwest of Sydney’s CBD and in close proximity to the M7 Motorway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The site is accessible at north-eastern corner via Hollinsworth Road and is currently vacant with previous rural/agricultural land uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 – Site Aerial Photograph

Source: Near Map
3.2. LOCALITY

The site is located in the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct, which forms part of the North-West Priority Growth Area under the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct Indicative Layout Plan released by the Department of Planning and Environment in 2010. The land release sought to provide additional land for employment generating uses needed to support a growing residential population.

The precinct will be a major economic foundation for the North-West Growth Centre, with numerous commercial, bulky goods retailing, industrial and residential developments emerging in the locality.

The site is surrounded by the following specific land uses:

- Directly **north** of the site is Ingenia Lifestyle Stoney Creek caravan park which has temporary and permanent housing accommodation zoned for industrial purposes.

  The TransGrid transmission line and easement are located approximately 40m to the north of the northwest corner of Lot 24. The most proximate tower is located approx. 130m north of Lot 24.

- Directly **south** of the site is a road reserve. The residential suburbs of Bidwell and Hassall Grove are located further south. The M7 is located approximately 1.5km south west of the site.

- Directly **east** of the site is an existing agricultural land use and vegetation. Further east are bulky goods, retail and other commercial/light industrial land uses recently developed and under construction. Richmond Road is approximately 1 km east and the residential suburb of Colebee is approximately 1.5km to the east.

- Directly **west** of the site are existing agricultural land uses and vegetation.
Figure 3 – Locality Plan

Source: Watch This Space Design

Figure 4 – Surrounding Development

Picture 1 – Neighbouring property to the east

Picture 2 – Neighbouring property to the north, 140 Hollinsworth Road

Picture 3 – New industrial development at 10 Hollinsworth Road

Picture 4 – New industrial development at 99 Hollinsworth Road

Source: Google Maps
3.3. SITE SUITABILITY

The warehouse and distribution centres and agricultural produce facility will be compatible with the industrial context of the surrounding area and the broader objectives of the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct. The development of the site presents a significant opportunity to create long term employment opportunities.

The surrounding Marsden Park Industrial Precinct and industrial land uses provides a suitable context in which to develop the proposal. The site is located in close proximity to connections to Richmond Road and the M7 contributing to its convenient and accessible location within the region.

In summary, the suitability of the site can be attributed to the following:

- SEPP (Growth Centres) permits the proposed development,
- Access to the regional road network,
- Compatibility with surrounding development and local context,
- Minimal impact on the environment, and
- Implementation of suitable mitigation measures where required.
### 4. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The proposed Logos Marsden Park industrial development and associated estate infrastructure works are summarised in Table 6. A detailed architectural package is provided at Appendix D for assessment.

**Table 6 – Proposal Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site area</strong></td>
<td>Site Area: 214,805sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other development areas</strong></td>
<td>Hollinsworth Road Widening: 1,120sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollinsworth Road Extension: 10,641sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access Road 1: 2,403sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access Road 2: 2,351sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access Road 3: 2,617sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Link Reserve: 5,734sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total developable area: 189,939sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Summary</strong></td>
<td>Proposed construction and operation of seven warehouse buildings with up to nine tenancies with the following total floor space and car parking spaces:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehouse: 101,139sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office: 6,633sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking spaces: 663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Land Use</strong></td>
<td>Building 3 (Austcor): Warehouse and Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building 5 (Valley Fresh): Agricultural Produce Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building 7 (eStore): Warehouse and Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 4 and 6: Warehouse and Distribution / Light Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Investment Value</strong></td>
<td>The total project Capital Investment Value (CIV), as defined under clause 3 of the <em>Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000</em>, is $128,763,128.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The total CIV for Building 3 (Austcor) is $60,127,850.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours of Operation</strong></td>
<td>24 hours a day, seven days a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping</strong></td>
<td>Landscaping has been designed in accordance with Blacktown City Council’s requirements and to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal for surrounding uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Roads</strong></td>
<td>The proponent will construct the access roads as part of this application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extension and widening of Hollinsworth Road will be constructed as part of DA15/275 (as amended).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The construction of the future bus link is not part of this application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1. **NEED FOR THE PROPOSAL**

The proposal seeks to facilitate the development of an integrated industrial estate providing warehouse, distribution and other industrial buildings for current and future tenants as demand arises. The site has excellent access to the M7 Motorway, a key factor for businesses with distribution components. There has been strong interest in the site by future tenants (including those proposed Austcor, Valley Fresh and EStore) as it offers an ideal location for distribution facilities.

4.2. **CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS**

The main options to undertaking the proposed development are considered to be:

- Do nothing,
- Develop site, or
- Alternative uses / layout.

4.2.1. **Do Nothing**

The ‘do nothing’ approach would result in the site remaining underdeveloped, despite the industrial rezoning designed to facilitate the redevelopment of land for employment generating uses.

4.2.2. **Develop Site**

The site falls within the North West Growth Centre Priority Precinct and an area known as the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct. The NSW State Government projects that the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct will deliver up to 10,000 new jobs. In accordance with the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006* the subject site is for industrial land uses, which is consistent with the overall development intent of the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct.

The proposed development aims to realise this opportunity, through the provision of 101,139sqm of warehousing and distribution facilities and operations.

4.2.3. **Consideration of Alternative uses / layout**

The proposal is the result of numerous iterations to establish the best possible scheme for the site in consideration of surrounding land uses, future possible land uses and the minimisation of external impacts.

The proposed layout has been dictated by the future bus reserve traversing the site from south to north, the future road reserve and the Hollinsworth Road extension and widening. The proposed site layout has been carefully developed following a number of operational studies to ensure the most efficient layout is realised for current and future tenants.

The design ensures trucks and visitors can access the site efficiently and safety, and circulate through the site and access the loading docks or parking areas. The access point rationalised and loading docks have been orientated away from the nearby sensitive receivers to minimise potential impacts.

4.3. **LAND USE AND OPERATION**

The following provides a description of the use and operation of Building 3, 5 and 7. The tenants for the remaining warehouses is unknown at the date of this report and accordingly consent is sought for warehouse and distribution, and light industry.

4.3.1. **Building 3 (Austcor)**

Austcor is a typical warehouse and distribution centre which provides logistics and packing solutions to local businesses. Austcor's operation is largely automated and requires the provision of facilities which necessitate the proposed high-bay elements. The Austcor warehouse will generally involve the following activities:

- Trucks arrive at site with goods from various local and international sources. The trucks reverse into loading docks and are unpacked by warehouse staff.
- Goods are transferred into the automated system and store within the warehouse ready for packing and distribution.
• Once the goods have been sorted and are ready for distribution it will be loaded onto trucks from the loading docks and distributed.

• Approximately 20 trucks will access the warehouse on any given day.

4.3.2. Building 5 (Valley Fresh)

Valleymore provides a range of specialised services within purpose built warehouses designed to maximise supply chain efficiencies. Valleymore operates a range of 'state of the art' machines to pack produce. Services include precooling, ripening, cool chain management, packing/repacking, storage, quality control, distribution and logistics and fumigation.

The Valley Fresh warehouse will generally involve the following activities:

• Trucks arrive at site delivering fresh produce on site from local, national and international sources. The trucks reverse into loading docks and are unpacked by warehouse staff.

• The produce is warehoused within the cold storage areas, ripened or fumigated if needed and packaged. Valley Fresh do not 'process' produce. Produce remains as it arrived. Only the way it is packed will change.

• Valley Fresh have confirmed they will store and use the following chemical on site:
  - 1 x 95kg cylinder of methyl bromide which is used for the fumigation of fresh produce as directed by quarantine. It will be stored in the service area in the rear of the fumigation chamber. This room is locked and appropriate safety signage displayed.
  - 3-4 x 30kg cylinders of ethylene gas which is used to ripen the fruit. The gas is stored as part of the ripening system with bollards to protect it. The gas is used in the ripening process. Gas cylinders are locked and appropriate signage is displayed

• Once the produce is ready for distribution it will be loaded onto trucks from the loading docks and distributed to various locations across NSW and beyond.

4.3.3. Building 7 (EStore)

EStore is a typical warehouse and distribution centre which provides logistics and order fulfilment for e-commerce and omni-channel retailers. Founded in 2008, EStore Logistics is one of Australia’s largest logistics providers of warehousing and order fulfilment services for online retail and retail store businesses.

The EStore warehouse will generally involve the following activities:

• Trucks arrive at site with goods from various local and international sources. The trucks reverse into loading docks and are unpacked by warehouse staff.

• Goods are packed using mailing bags, cartons and pallets. The machinery onsite is pallet wrapping machines with limited automation.

• Once the goods have been sorted and are ready for distribution it will be loaded onto trucks from the loading docks and distributed.

• Approximately 15 trucks will access the warehouse on any given day.

4.4. OPERATIONAL

Operational staff breakdown for each warehouse includes:

• Building 3 (Austcor): 125
• Building 5 (Valley Fresh): 76
• Building 7 (EStore): 80
• Building 1, 2, 4 and 6: tenants unknown

The proposed hours of operation for all buildings is 24 hours a day, seven days a week.
4.5. **SIGNAGE**

Indicative signage zones have been included on the elevational plans for indicative purposes. All signage content and dimensions will be the subject of a future development application.

4.6. **DEVELOPMENT STAGING**

The proposed development will be constructed in four stages. The staging plan and delivery program of the individual warehouse buildings is indicative and is subject to tenant enquiries and will depend upon tenant demand. Works on the site will follow a logical sequence involving:

- Site clearing and demolition completed in one activity (approved under DA15/275 as modified).
- Earthworks, retaining walls, civil works and services delivery completed in one activity (approved under DA15/275 as modified).
- Staged construction of individual warehouses (as per indicative staging plan at Figure 5).

Initial tenant demand is strong and therefore works may happen sequentially or overlap to some extent to meet tenant time frames.

All civil works including site regrading and bulk earthworks will be carried out in a single continuous phase activity (approved under DA15/275 as modified). Construction time for warehouses is expected to take approximately 9 – 12 months for the major warehouses, again depending upon tenant demand. Figure 5 shows how the development will be staged and the following provides detail of works at each of the four stages.

Figure 5 – Indicative Staging Plan

Source: Logos Property and Watch This Space Design
5. PLANNING FRAMEWORK

This section provides an assessment of the relevant statutory and strategic considerations applying to the site contained in the following planning policy:

Statutory Planning Policies
- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999
- Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979
- Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000
- State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011
- State Environmental Planning Policy 55 (Remediation of Land)
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006

Strategic Planning Policies
- A Plan for Growing Sydney
- Towards our Greater Sydney 2056
- Draft West Central District Plan

This planning framework is considered in detail in the following sections.

5.1. ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AND BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION ACT 1999

The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) commenced in July 2000 and provides the legal mechanism and framework to protect and manage nationally and internationally important flora, fauna, ecological communities and heritage places.

The proposed development does not trigger any sections of the EPBC Act, therefore in the circumstance of the proposal the EPBC Act does not apply to the site.

5.2. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT ACT 1979

5.2.1. Considerations under Section 79C

The EP&A Act is the key legislation in NSW that provides the legal mechanism and framework for development. Development that falls under Part 4 of the EP&A Act must demonstrate that it has considered the matters listed in Section 79C.

The proposed development has been assessed in accordance with the matters of consideration listed in Section 79C of the Act as outlined below in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79C(1)(a)(i) Environmental Planning Instruments</td>
<td>State and Local Environmental Planning Instruments have been assessed in Section 5 of this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79C(1)(a)(ii) Draft Environmental Planning Instruments</td>
<td>No draft Environmental Planning Instruments are applicable to the site at the date of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Object</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consideration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proponent is currently preparing a Planning Proposal seeking to realign the Hollinsworth Road extension to support the future development of Lot 24 DP262886 for the proposed development. The Planning Proposal seeks to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realign the SP2 Infrastructure (Local Road) zone located on part Lot 24 DP262886 and part Lot 25 DP262886 (Ingenia site) approximately 12m south so that the entire SP2 zone (and land reservation acquisition parameters) is located on Lot 24. This will enable the full width road construction on Lot 24, although ‘roads’ are permissible on all zones on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realign the SP2 zone on the adjoining lots to the west in order for the Hollinsworth Road extension to intersect with the future South Street extension at a right angle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Planning Proposal does not seek to amend the existing permissible land uses or built form controls for the site. The proposed SSDA does not rely on the Planning Proposal for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79C(1)(a)(iii) Development Control Plans</strong></td>
<td>The proposed development is assessed against the Blacktown City Council Growth Centre Precincts DCP 2016 in Section 5.9, however pursuant to clause 11 of State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011, DCPs do not apply to SSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79C(1)(a)(iiia) Planning Agreement</strong></td>
<td>The proponent will be entering into a Works-in-Kind (WIK) agreement with Council. However, the scope of the works within the WIK agreement are proposed under the Section 96(2) to DA15/275 and do not form part of this SSDA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79C(1)(a)(iv) Any Matters Prescribed by the Regulations</strong></td>
<td>This SSDA has been prepared in accordance with Part 14, Clause 228 of the Regulations outlining the factors that must be taken into account concerning the impact of an activity on the environment. In addition, this EIS is prepared in accordance with the relevant requirements of Schedule 2 of the Regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79C(1)(b) Likely Impacts of the Development</strong></td>
<td>An impact assessment has been provided in Section 6 of this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79C(1)(c) Suitability of the Site</strong></td>
<td>Section 0 of this EIS demonstrates that the proposal is suitable for the site. The proposal is permissible within the land use zone and meets the objectives of the zone. Further, the proposal achieves the NSW State Government’s desired future outcome for the area and supports the State Government’s strategic vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79C(1)(d) Any submissions made in accordance with this Act or the Regulations</strong></td>
<td>Submissions received from government agencies following the submission of the preliminary supporting documents (request for SEARs, etc.) have been reviewed and where relevant, incorporated into the design development of the proposed works and addressed in this EIS. Any submissions received during the exhibition period are required to be considered under Section 79C of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79C(1)(e) The Public Interest</strong></td>
<td>The proposal is in the public interest as it provides employment in the area to support the growth of the region, while meeting the NSW State Government’s strategic vision for the precinct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2. **Objects of the EP&A Act 1979**

The objects of the EP&A Act are assessed in Table 8 below.

**Table 8 – Objects of the Act**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To encourage</td>
<td>The EIS demonstrates that the proposal is suitable for the site and has considered the associated impacts on site and surrounding area. The proposal promotes employment in the precinct and encourages an improved economic outcome in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proper management, development and conservation of natural and</td>
<td>The EIS has considered the impacts on relevant utility services. The EIS found that there is ample supply of the relevant services to support the operation of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artificial resources, including agricultural land, natural areas,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forests, minerals, water, cities, towns and villages for the purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of promoting the social and economic welfare of the community and a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The promotion and co-ordination of the orderly and economic use and</td>
<td>The proposed development for a warehouse and distribution centre is considered to promote the orderly and economic use of industrially zoned land in the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct, as intended under the SRGC SEPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The protection, provision and co-ordination of communication and</td>
<td>The EIS has considered the impacts on relevant utility services. The EIS found that there is ample supply of the relevant services to support the operation of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utility services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of land for public purposes</td>
<td>Not applicable to this SSDA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision and co-ordination of community services and facilities</td>
<td>Not applicable to this SSDA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The protection of the environment, including the protection and</td>
<td>The proposal includes specific mitigation measures to minimise impacts to the environment. It is also anticipated that appropriate conditions of consent will be imposed to ensure the protection of the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation of native animals and plants, including threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>species, populations and ecological communities, and their habitats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecologically sustainable development</td>
<td>The project will meet the requirements of all relevant ESD policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision and maintenance of affordable housing</td>
<td>Not applicable to this SSDA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote the sharing of the responsibility for environmental</td>
<td>It is expected that the proposal will be referred to the relevant Government agencies for comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning between the different levels of government in the State, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide increased opportunity for public involvement and</td>
<td>It is anticipated that this SSDA application will undergo the required notification and exhibition period to allow public and agency comment and recommendations. Additionally, the proponent has undertaken detailed consultation with various stakeholders in the preparation of this EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation in environmental planning and assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3. ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT REGULATION 2000

The EP&A Act and accompanying Regulations establishes the legislative planning framework for NSW.

This document is consistent with the requirements for Environmental Impact Statements in Clauses 6 and 7 of Schedule 2 of the Regulation.

While consideration must be given to the objects of the Act, the application is lodged under the State Significant Development provisions of the Act and in accordance with the State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011 (SRD SEPP). Therefore, the proposal is not classed as a designated development under Schedule 3 of the Regulations.

5.4. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY (STATE AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT) 2011

Clause 8(1) of the SRD SEPP provides that the development specified in Schedule 1 or 2 of the SRD SEPP is ‘State Significant Development’

Clause 12 of Schedule 1 provides for the following:

(1) Development that has a capital investment value of more than $50 million for the purpose of warehouses or distribution centres (including container storage facilities) at one location and related to the same operation.

The total project Capital Investment Value (CIV), as defined under clause 3 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, is $128,763,128.

The total CIV for Building 3 (Austcor) is $60,127,850 which meets the threshold for SSD.

A Quantity Surveyor Statement of cost prepared by Altus Group certifying the CIV of the proposed development is attached as Appendix B.

5.5. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 33 – HAZARDOUS AND OFFENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

The State Environmental Planning Policy No. 33 – Hazardous and Offensive Development (SEPP 33) applies where a development application may be considered to be a potentially hazardous industry or potentially offensive industry. Two of the aims of SEPP 33 include:

(d) to ensure that in determining whether a development is a hazardous or offensive industry, any measures proposed to be employed to reduce the impact of the development are taken into account, and

(e) to ensure that in considering any application to carry out potentially hazardous or offensive development, the consent authority has sufficient information to assess whether the development is hazardous or offensive and to impose conditions to reduce or minimise any adverse impact, and

Clause 3 of the SEPP provides the definition of a hazardous and offensive industry. Clause 4 of the SEPP offers other definitions to be considered when applying the SEPP, including, hazardous storage establishment and offensive storage establishment. Should a development be determined to be a hazardous or offensive industry and/or include the storage of hazardous or offensive material then a ‘preliminary hazardous analysis’ may be required to support a proposed development.

From consultation with DPEs hazards team it is understood that the 95kg volume of methyl bromide does not trigger the thresholds for what is defined as a hazardous or offensive industry under SEPP 33 and accordingly a preliminary hazardous analysis is not required.
5.6. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 55 - REMEDIATION OF LAND

Under the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy No. 55 - Remediation of Land (SEPP 55), where a development application is made concerning land that may be contaminated, the consent authority must not grant consent unless:

- It has considered whether the land is contaminated, and
- If the land is contaminated, it is satisfied that the land is suitable for the purposes for which the development is proposed to be carried out, it is satisfied that the land will be remediated before the land is used for that purpose.

The approved development DA15/275 assessed the potential for contamination on site and the consent included a Condition of Consent No. 3.7 ‘Site Contamination’ that required a detailed contamination assessment to be undertaken prior to issue of a Construction Certificate. Refer to the Contamination Report at Appendix K.

5.7. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY (INFRASTRUCTURE 2007)

State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (ISEPP) aims to facilitate the effective delivery of infrastructure across the State.

Traffic Generating Development

Clause 104 of the ISEPP provides for certain proposals, known as Traffic Generating Development, to be referred to NSW Roads and Maritime Services for concurrence.

Schedule 3 lists the types of development that are defined as Traffic Generating Development. The referral thresholds for ‘Industry’ are:

- 20,000sqm or more GFA with site access to any road; or
- 5000sqm or more in GFA where the site has access to a classified road or to a road that connects to a classified road (if access is within 90 metres of connection, measured along the alignment of the connecting road).

The proposed development will create 101,139sqm of warehousing GFA and 6,633sqm of ancillary office space. The traffic generating potential of the proposed use will trigger referral to the RMS under schedule 3 of the ISEPP.

Development adjacent to road reservations

The subject site is located directly adjacent to the SP2 Classified Road reservation for the future Bells Line of Road Castlereagh Connection. The consent authority must consider the proposal under clause 101 of the ISEPP.

Refer to the Traffic, Parking and Access Assessment Report at Appendix H.

5.8. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY (SYDNEY REGION GROWTH CENTRES) 2006

The State Environment Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres 2006) (SRGC SEPP), is the principal environmental planning instrument applicable to the site.

5.8.1. Zoning and Permissibility

The site is zoned part IN2 Light Industrial and SP2 Infrastructure under the SRGC SEPP as indicated in Figure 6. The proposed development seeks consent for the construction and operation of the following facilities across the portion of the site zoned IN2 Light Industrial:

- Building 3 (Austcor): Warehouse and Distribution Centre.
- Building 5 (Valley Fresh): Agricultural Produce Industry.
• Building 7 (eStore): Warehouse and Distribution Centre.
• Building 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 4 and 6: Warehouse/Distribution and Light Industry – the exact land use is to be determine upon confirmation of the tenant.

The Growth Centres SEPP identifies warehouse and distribution centres as a permissible use in the IN2 Light Industrial zone.

Valley Fresh is best defined as an ‘agricultural produce industry’.

**agricultural produce industry** means an industry involving the handling, treating, processing or packing of produce from agriculture (including dairy products, seeds, fruit, vegetables or other plant material), and includes flour mills, cotton seed oil plants, cotton gins, feed mills, cheese and butter factories, and juicing or canning plants, but does not include a livestock processing industry.

‘Agricultural produce industry’ sits under the group term ‘rural industry’

**rural industry** means an industry that involves the handling, treating, production, processing or packing of animal or plant agricultural products, and includes:

(a) **agricultural produce industry**, or

‘Rural industry’ is a discrete and separate group term from ‘industry’. ‘Rural industry’ and ‘agricultural produce industry’ is are both permitted with consent by way of not being explicitly prohibited within the Land Use table of the IN2 zone in Appendix 5 of the Growth Centres SEPP.

The objectives of the IN2 Light Industrial zone are identified as:

• To provide a wide range of light industrial, warehouse and related land uses.
• To encourage employment opportunities and to support the viability of centres.
• To minimise any adverse effect of industry on other land uses.
• To enable other land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of workers in the area

The proposal meets the zone objectives in the following ways:

• The proposal provides for a range of land uses including warehouse and distribution, agricultural produce facility and light industry (potentially for the buildings with unknown tenants).
• The proposal will provide significant construction employment and ongoing operational warehouse and office jobs.
• As detail further in this EIS, the impacts to surrounding land uses has been assessed to be minimal and mitigation measures proposed.
• The proposal does not limit other land uses within the area to be developed to meet the daily needs of local and workers.
5.8.2. Height of Buildings

In accordance with the Growth Centres SEPP, the maximum building height applicable to the site is 16m measured from existing ground level. The proposal complies with the maximum building height development standard, except for in the following locations:

- Building 1A and 1B: 3.2m variation (20%)
- Building 2A and 2B: 1m variation (6.25%)
- Building 3 (Northern High-Bay): 2.5m (15.625%)
- Building 3 (Southern High-Bay): 0.3 (1.875%)
- Building 6: 3.5m (21.875%)

The height breaches on Building 3 are the result of the proposed high-bay built forms. The proposed high-bay elements are unique to the Austcor proposal and are the result of operational and functional requirements to store large volumes of goods and respond to contemporary market conditions for increased automation of warehouse and distribution centres. The revised version of *Towards our Greater Sydney 2056* acknowledges this trend to high-bay warehouses as "automation is driving the adaptation of buildings to accommodate high-bay automation, which requires building heights greater than existing buildings and current planning limits. Increased building heights are needed for the evolution of buildings". The proposed locations for the high-bay elements sought to minimise the impacts such as overshadowing and visual impact.

The height breaches on Buildings 1, 2 and 6 are the result of the site’s topography. As shown on the Survey Plan (Appendix C) the site ungrades and accordingly requires cut and fill in various locations to create flat and functional pads for buildings, access and hardstand. Buildings 1, 2 and 6 are all 13.7m high when measured from the finished pad level to the roof ridge. However, ‘building height’ under the Growth Centres SEPP is measured from existing ground level to the highest point of the building. As such, in parts of the site where a large quantum of fill is required, the 13.7m high building breaks the 16m height limit.

Each breach is described and shown in elevation in the following figures. The orange line represents the existing ground level at the face of the relevant elevation and is projected up 16m to represent the maximum height limit. A Clause 4.6 variation is included at Appendix S providing justification that compliance with the building height development standard unreasonable and there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the height breach.
Building 1A and 1B
The western portion of Building 1A and 1B breaches the maximum height limit by 3.2m at the highest point. This is illustrated by the orange line in Figure 7.

Figure 7 – Building 1A and 1B – Building Height Breach – north elevation

Building 2A and 2B
The western portion of Building 2A and 2B breaches the maximum height limit by 1m at the highest point. This is illustrated by the orange line in Figure 8.

Figure 8 - Building 2A and 2B – Building Height Breach – north elevation
**Building 3 - High Bay**

The northern high-bay of Building 3 breaches the maximum height limit by 2.5m at the highest point (western elevation). The southern high-bay of Building 3 breaches the maximum height limit by 0.3m at the highest point (southern elevation). This is illustrated by the orange line in Figure 9.

Figure 9 – Building 3 – Building Height Breach

**Building 6**

The southern portion of Building 6 breaches the maximum height limit by 3.5m at the highest point (on southern elevation). This is illustrated by the orange line in Figure 10.

Figure 10 - Building 6 – Building Height Breach – southern elevation

Source: Watch This Space
Building 7

Building 7 does not breach the height limit. As shown on the southern elevation extract in Figure 11, the height plane (in orange) hugs the roof of Building 7 on the eastern side. The building height plane is taken at the face of the relevant elevation.

Figure 11 - Building 7 – Building Height – southern elevation

Source: Watch This Space
5.8.3. **Floor Space Ratio**

The maximum floor space ratio (FSR) is 0.7:1.

The proposed development includes a total gross floor area of 107,772sqm. The site has a total area of 214,805sqm. Therefore, the proposed FSR is 0.57:1.

The proposal complies with the maximum FSR development standard.

5.8.4. **Public Utility Infrastructure**

Under clause 6.1, the consent authority must not grant consent to development on land to which the Precinct Plan applies unless:

'It is satisfied that any public utility infrastructure that is essential for the proposed development is available or that adequate arrangements have been made to make that infrastructure available when required.'

The proposal is supported by a Services and Infrastructure Statement (Appendix Q) that confirms that there are sufficient services to support the operation of the proposal.

5.9. **BLACKTOWN CITY COUNCIL GROWTH CENTRES PRECINCTS DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN**

The Blacktown City Council Growth Centre Precincts Development Control Plan 2010 (the Growth Centres DCP) provides detailed guidance for development within the parts of the North West Growth Centre that are within the Blacktown LGA.

The Growth Centres DCP does not apply to SSD. However, Logos has sought to meet the controls in the Growth Centres DCP where possible. In particular, applicable controls in Schedule 3 – Marsden Park Industrial Precinct of the Growth Centres SEPP has been assessed against the proposed development, which is provided in the table below. The assessment shows the proposed development is considered to be generally consistent with the development controls in the DCP.

**Table 9 – Sch.3 MPiP of the Growth Centres DCP Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCP Section</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Subdivision Planning and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td><strong>The Marsden Park Industrial Precinct – Precinct Planning Vision</strong></td>
<td>The proposal meets the vision Schedule 3 Marsden Park Industrial Precinct of the Growth Centres DCP given it offers employment based uses within 30 minutes of the growing residential area to the north of site. The proposal significantly contributes to vision of the overall precinct and future economic viability of the precinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The vision for the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct is to create an attractive employment precinct that provides for a diverse range of job opportunities to support the growing residential areas in Sydney’s North West. The precinct will be characterised by a mix of employment generating uses such as general and light industrial, business parks, and commercial uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td><strong>Referenced Figures</strong></td>
<td>The site includes existing areas of moderate Aboriginal significance. This EIS is supported by a detailed assessment of heritage items on the site prepared by Associates Archaeology &amp; Heritage Pty Ltd. The assessment found that the proposal is likely to have some impact on Aboriginal heritage items/sites, however the developer should seek to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure 2.2: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCP Section</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obtain an AHIP to undertake future works on the site. Refer to Section 6.13, Appendix O and Appendix P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.3: Riparian Protection Area and Biodiversity Certification</td>
<td>The figure shows that the site is not affected by any ecological constraints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.4: Bushfire Risk and Asset Protection Zone Requirements</td>
<td>The figure shows that the site requires a 15 metre APZ on its southern boundary. A detailed assessment of the potential bushfire risk is provided at Appendix J and in Section 6.11 of this EIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Neighbourhood and Subdivision Design

3.1. Hollinsworth Road is identified as a sub-arterial road. A north-south connection through the site is required from Hollinsworth Road to the existing freeway reservation on the southern boundary of the site. The proposal complies with the road network shown in the DCP.

3.1.1 Public Transport and Pedestrian Cycle Network

Objective

To encourage the use of public transport through the provision of integrated bus routes, pedestrian and cycle routes.

Controls

Bus stops should be provided generally in accordance with Figure 3-2. The final location of bus stops will be determined by bus operators and the Ministry of Transport in consultation with Blacktown City Council.

Provision for a future bus only link to the south and vehicle access to the Castlereagh Freeway should be made in accordance with Figure 3-2.

Pedestrian and cycle links and routes should generally be provided in accordance with Figure 3.3.

The proposal does not hinder the ability for a future bus route to service the area, does not hinder the ability for a bicycle network and nor does it hinder the ability for relevant bus stops to be provided. The proposal includes a future transport link through site as required by the DCP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCP Section</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Figure 5.1 Building Setbacks</td>
<td>The generally complies with the relevant setbacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern boundary – 3 metres</td>
<td>The hardstand area for car parking and access at Building 3 is located in the setback zone. This is justified as large trees and screening landscaping will be planted between the hardstand and Hollinsworth Road/bus reserve which will minimise the minor visual impact. No building will be located within this setback zone. Refer to enclosed Architectural Plans at Appendix D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street frontage – 7.5 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal transport link – 7.5 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3</td>
<td><strong>Development Surrounding the Existing Caravan Park</strong></td>
<td>The precinct is undergoing a major transformation to an industrial precinct park. The assessment of the proposal has considered the impacts to the Ingenia caravan park to the north of the site, in particular with respect to visual/view and the acoustic impacts. The proposal includes landscaping along Hollinsworth Road and throughout the site in order to provide a soft edge to the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>The site location means that the proposal does not overshadow the caravan park. The proposal does not diminish the ability of the caravan park to achieve a high quality amount of solar access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To minimise impacts from industrial development on the existing Caravan Park.</td>
<td>Hollinsworth Road has a total road reserve of 24 metres. The road provides an urban barrier/setback between the caravan park and proposal. Further, all loading docks have been located in the middle of the site surrounded by built form to further minimise the impact of operational noise and sleep disturbance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To provide for a landscaped buffer between industrial development and the existing Caravan Park.</td>
<td>The proposal includes a frontage setback as per the DCP which creates further separation from the caravan park. This setback will be landscaped providing a soft edge between the proposal and Hollinsworth Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure the boundary between industrial development and the Caravan Park is not dominated by over-shadowing or noise generating activities.</td>
<td>Location of car parking provided to comply with DCP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, other provisions that may apply to development contained in this DCP, the following provisions apply to all development adjacent to the existing Caravan Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum 20 metre buffer zone is to be provided between the Caravan Park boundary and any industrial development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The buffer zone is to include high quality landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee car parking, storage and other non-intrusive uses are permitted within the buffer zone. Noise generating activities are not permitted within the buffer zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Caravan Park ceases to continuing operating as a business, Clause 5.1.3 will no longer apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.10. **BLACKTOWN CITY COUNCIL MARSDEN PARK INDUSTRIAL PRECINCT CONTRIBUTIONS PLAN NO.21 2013**

The Blacktown City Council Marsden Park Industrial Precinct Contributions Plan No.21 v2013 applies to the site. Contributions are calculated on the ‘developable area’ of the site and are only levied once within the conditions of consent.

The existing subdivision consent (DA15/275) in Condition 7.1.1 required the payment of developer contributions. The proponent will be entering into a works-in-kind agreement with Council for the construction of Hollinsworth Road and drainage infrastructure required to support the precinct catchment.

5.11. **A PLAN FOR GROWING SYDNEY**

*A Plan for Growing Sydney* (the Plan) released by DP&E in December 2014, is the NSW Government’s strategic planning vision for metropolitan Sydney.

The site is situated within the West Central subregion of the Plan. The Plan identifies planning for a concentration of high value economic activity in Marsden Park in business and industrially zoned areas as a key priority for the West Central subregion. This is supported by Direction 1.4 of the Plan, *“Transforming the productivity of Western Sydney through growth and investment”* which emphasises the significant role Western Sydney has in NSW’s economy. These priorities reflect the overarching principles of the Plan related to providing jobs closer to home, creating a competitive economy and protecting key employment lands.

The proposed industrial estate will strengthen economic investment in the region, and provide construction and operational employment opportunities in the rapidly growing North West Urban Renewal Corridor. The site is also strategically located in close proximity to the regional road network, and ongoing and planned transport infrastructure. The proposal will therefore deliver jobs closer to homes, and contribute towards improved productivity and liveability in Western Sydney.

Given the strategic location of the site and the significant contribution of employment generating uses proposed, it is considered that the proposal supports the directions and overarching goals of *A Plan for Growing Sydney*. 
5.12. TOWARDS OUR GREATER SYDNEY 2056

In November 2016, the Greater Sydney Commission (GSC) released Towards our Greater Sydney 2056 (the Strategy). This plan aims to deliver a new vision to address the growth and future of Greater Sydney.

The fundamental difference between A Plan for Growing Sydney and this plan is that Towards our Greater Sydney 2056 focuses the strategic urban planning vision for Greater Sydney on the regional significance of central and western Sydney. The plan states:

“As the new economic activity around the Western Sydney Airport starts to emerge and as the success of the Sydney City in the east continues, the Greater Parramatta and the Olympic Peninsula (referred to as GPOP) will develop its role as Greater Sydney’s second city region.

This means a shift away from thinking of Greater Sydney as a place anchored by an economically strong single central business district – a monocentric approach – and instead looking at the outstanding assets in three cities and the many local places and connections between these cities – a genuine polycentric approach.”

The core strategy of the plan is to envisage Greater Sydney as three cities while establishing a framework that can better deliver strategic planning outcomes for a more productive, liveable and sustainable city. The three cities identified in the plan include the Eastern City, Central City and Western City. The site is located in the indicative transition area between the Central City and the Western City.

In October 2017, a revised version of Towards our Greater Sydney 2056 was released by the GSC titled, Draft Greater Sydney Region Plan (revised Strategy). The revised Strategy retains the central theme of a three-city model for the greater Sydney metropolitan area. The revised Strategy identifies Marsden Park as a Strategic Centre, therefore recognising that the centre plays a vital role in the future growth of the metropolitan area. Importantly, the proposal meets the above objectives and supports the Greater Sydney Commission’s vision for Greater Sydney by offering a large warehouse logistics centre and light industry that generates employment that is located near future residential housing and the Marsden Park Town Centre.

The revised Strategy acknowledges the desired approach to managing industrial lands and considers the following matters relevant to the proposal:
• Automation is driving the adaptation of buildings to accommodate high-bay automation, which requires building heights greater than existing buildings and current planning limits. Increased building heights are needed for the evolution of buildings in areas such as the Central River City, that have logistics functions linked to freight infrastructure networks.

• Manufacturing techniques are changing rapidly in response to technological and digital improvements creating new business models and advanced manufacturing. These changes may require a review of planning regulations which may be placing unnecessary barriers to the growth of advanced manufacturing.

The proposal is consistent with these matters as the Logos Logistics Estate employs high-bays elements to respond to changing industrial market conditions and technological advances.

5.13. REVISED DRAFT CENTRAL CITY DISTRICT PLAN

In October 2017, the GSC released a revised version of the District Plan known as the Draft Central District Plan (District Plan). The revised District Plan is now one of five district plans that come under the revised metropolitan strategy, the Draft Greater Sydney Region Plan.

The District Plan sets out priorities relating to improving the productivity, liveability and sustainability of the Central district. The revised District Plan identifies Marsden Park as a Strategic Centre and also identifies that Marsden Park forms part of the investigation route for a new train link/mass transit connections between St. Marys and Rouse Hill. It is understood that this transit link will provide railway connectivity to Western Sydney and further to Leppington. The Central City District Structure Plan 2036, identifies Marsden Park within an area designated as Land Release Area, as shown below.

Figure 13 – Central City District Plan

The key direction and priorities that apply to the site include:

• Direction:
  – Jobs and skills for the city – creating the conditions for a stronger economy;

• Priorities:
  – Planning Priority C10 - Growing investment, business opportunities and jobs in strategic centres;

Source: NSW Government
- Planning Priority C11 - Maximising opportunities to attract advanced manufacturing and innovation in industrial and urban services land; and
- Planning Priority C12 - Supporting growth of targeted industry sectors.

With respect to ‘Priority C10’ while the site does appear to be not directly located within the Marsden Park strategic centre, the proposal is considered an important project within the growth of the Marsden Park suburb and corridor along Richmond Road. Moreover, the project generates employment and also assists in providing jobs near existing and future housing.

Marsden Park is projected to accommodate between 5,000 – 10,000 jobs by 2036. The proposed development contributes to the projected employment in the area, through the provision of approximately 107,700sqm of warehousing and distribution facilities. In light of the above and key planning priorities, it is considered that the proposal demonstrates that it has significant strategic urban planning merit.
6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

In addition to the general requirements, the SEARs for the proposal outlined a number of Key Issues to be addressed as part of an EIS. This section of the report assesses and responds to the environmental impacts of the proposed development.

6.1. BUILT FORM AND LAYOUT

The proposed warehouse built form consists of typical large format buildings supported by road network and landscaping. The design and specific location of the proposed buildings have been provided in a manner to ensure the most efficient use of land and operation of future uses.

The proposal provides landscape streetscapes to create a soft visual and physical buffer between the proposed building and streets. The built form in combination with the streets and relevant entry points ensure the most efficient vehicular access to the site. The following photomontages illustrates how the proposed masterplan integrates with surrounding land use, including Ingenia Park to the north and the residential land to the south.

The warehouses are generally 13.7m high from the finished pad level, except for the high-bay elements which have been located to minimise external visual and shadow impacts whilst providing efficient and functional operation.

External building facades for the main warehouse areas are a combination of precast concrete wall panels and a colourbond steel metal cladding. Warehouse facades will consist of painted dado panel precast, with metal cladding above being the dominant material and utilises alternative colours and cladding material orientation to visually break up the warehouse length facade components. The colours of all buildings will be uniformed to create an identifiable consistency across the estate, however, no dominant bright colours are proposed with the building form which could potentially draw attention to the development from visual receptors. The dominance of materiality will be softened over time when the landscape is expected to be at full maturity within the setbacks and carparking areas.

Refer to the Design Statement (Appendix D) prepared by Watch This Space Design for further commentary of the built form, urban design and layout strategy.

Figure 14 – Photomontage looking south-west

Source: Watch This Space Design
6.2. VISUAL ANALYSIS

Geoscapes Pty Ltd (Geoscapes) was commissioned by Logos Property to prepare a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Report (LVIA). The report provides a detailed discussion on the methodology used to conduct the analysis, which includes providing the various categories for defining the sensitivity of a changing landscape for future receptors.

Geoscapes conducted a site visit on 26 September 2017 at 9am. The purpose of the site inspection was to record the existing site’s landscape and visual attributes, consider views to and from the nearest receptors and envisage the proposed development on the site.

Geoscapes prepared a visual analysis from a number of viewpoints. The location of the viewpoints and result of the analysis is presented in Table 10 and Figure 16 below.

Figure 15 – Photomontage looking north east

Source: Watch This Space Design

Table 10 – Visual Analysis Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Analysis Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ingenia Caravan Park East Looking South</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caravan Park West Looking South East</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ramosus Way – Close to Public Footpath Looking North East</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Daniels Road – Looking North</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lowles Park – Looking North-West</td>
<td>Moderate/minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stockholm Avenue West, Hassle Grove – Looking North</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Trent Place, Hassel Grove – Looking North-West</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Trudy Place, Hassel Grove – Looking North-West</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Amelia Way, Bidwell – Looking North</td>
<td>Moderate/minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stockholm Avenue East, Hassle Grove – Looking North-West</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Baitul Huda Mosque – Looking East</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Shalvey/Bidwell Public Reserve – Looking North-East</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mittigar Reserve – Looking North-West</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Woodburn Street, Colebee – Looking East</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>South Street, Marsden Park – Looking South-East</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section provides further detail on each viewpoint considered to be of major significance.

**Viewpoint 1: Ingenia Caravan Park East looking South**

Viewpoint 1 is taken from the southern part of the caravan park looking directly onto the proposed development. The following provides Geoscapes visual impact assessment of this key location:

- **Visual Sensitivity:** The majority of residential properties from this location are in very close proximity of the development. For residents, the existing view is likely to have a high local value. Therefore, it can be judged that sensitivity of these receptors to the development is high.

- **Magnitude of Change:** Based on the development proposals, it is judged that receptors from this location would experience a very high magnitude of change to their baseline view.

- **Significance of Visual Impact:** The significance of the visual impact for residential caravans facing the development and from the communal space, would be major.

Figure 17 provides the baseline photo showing the current environment, the post-development year 0 vegetation growth, and the post-development year 15 vegetation growth (fully growth). This shows that although there may be evitable change to the outlook currently experienced by residents within the caravan park, upon full growth of the proposed landscaping along Hollinsworth Road (street trees and setback landscaping) the northern elevation will be adequately screened from view.
**Figure 17 – Viewpoint 1: Baseline, post-development year 0, post-development year 15 (fully grown)**

**Figure 32: Viewpoint 1 – Baseline Photo**

**Figure 33: Viewpoint 1 – Baseline, year 0**

**Figure 34: Viewpoint 1 – Baseline Photo**

**Figure 35: Viewpoint 1 – Baseline Photo**

**Source:** Geoscapes and Watch This Space

**Viewpoint 2: Caravan Park West looking South East**

Viewpoint 2 is taken from the south-west part of the caravan park looking south directly onto the proposed development. The following provides Geoscapes visual impact assessment of this key location:

- **Visual Sensitivity:** The majority of residential properties from this location are in close proximity of the development. Therefore, it can be judged that sensitivity of these receptors is classed as high.

- **Magnitude of Change:** It is believed that receptors from this location would experience a very high magnitude of change.

- **Significance of Visual Impact:** The significance of the visual impact for residential caravans facing the development, would be major.

Figure 18 shows that although there may be evitable change to the outlook currently experienced by residents within the caravan park, upon full growth of the proposed landscaping along Hollinsworth Road (street trees and setback landscaping) the northern elevation will be adequately screened from view.
Viewpoint 4: Daniels Road looking North

Viewpoint 4 was taken from the end of residential dwellings on Daniels Road. The existing view is of open grassland with scattered native trees. The backdrop being the development site. Densely wooded areas are seen to the east and west with an increase in elevational rise. The following provides Geoscapes visual impact assessment of this key location:

- **Visual Sensitivity:** Residents are likely to hold the view in high value and there are many north facing residential properties with unobstructed direct views to the development site. The sensitivity for receivers near this location is considered to be high.

- **Magnitude of Change:** The magnitude of change for this receptor is considered to be very high. The view is at close range and the proposed development will be a new prominent feature in the landscape.

- **Significance of Visual Impact:** The significance of the visual impact for properties with a similar view as represented at this viewpoint are judged to be major. Following the construction of the proposed M9 link, the significance of visual impact for these receptors will require reassessment. The M9 would be subject to a full LVIA and cumulative impacts would be assessed.

Figure 19 shows that the southern elevation will be highly visual from the northern properties in Bidwill. However, given that the foreground shown in the figure below is a RMS road reservation, the area is subject to significant change including a potential elevated motorway and acoustic walls.
Geoscapes conclude that the development would impact some user groups in the surrounding area, particularly in relation to the 18m high-bay components of the proposal. However, most of the locations and groups/persons impacted would be at a significant distance away from the development, whereby they will, “not suffer significant adverse visual impacts.”

Geoscapes also make reference to the inclusion of landscape buffer zones, which by virtue of their treatment would contribute to minimising visual impacts to surrounding properties. Finally, the surrounding dense woodland further mitigates any potential visual impacts to receivers at wider reaching views across the area. Refer to Appendix L for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Report.

6.3. **LANDSCAPE**

Geoscapes Pty Ltd (Geoscapes) was commissioned by Logos Property to prepare a *Landscape Design Report (LDR)*. The report provides a detailed discussion on the design intent of the proposed landscaping.

The LDR provides the design approach under the following design elements, which are:

- Landscape buffer zones; and
- Internal buildings, carparks and surrounds.

The design incorporates Cumberland Plan Woodland to create native landscape buffer zones. The location of landscaping and size and location of buffer zones are strategically located to provide a soft interface with adjoining land and provide screening for the proposal from adjoining properties. For example, on the northern boundary on Hollinsworth Road, landscaping has been introduced to screen the proposal from Ingenia Caravan Park to the north.

The proposed landscaping has also been carefully considered in relation to bushfire APZ requirements. The widths and landscaping of the buffer zones vary from 3m to 40m. The proposed landscaping follows the RFS Planning for Bushfire Protection Guidelines on all boundaries where an APZ applies.

Figure 20 provides an extract of the proposed landscaping across the site.
The LDR includes detailed planting schedule and is supported by detailed landscape plans enclosed with this EIS. Further, detailed landscape impacts mitigation measures are provided in Section 7 of this report. Refer to Appendix E of this report for the Landscape Design Report and supporting landscape plans.

6.4. TRAFFIC, PARKING AND ACCESS

GTA Consultants Pty Ltd (GTA) were engaged to prepare a detailed Transport Impact Assessment addressing the potential traffic related impacts and the on-site car parking and loading arrangements.

6.4.1. Traffic Impacts

Key findings from GTA’s Transport Impact Assessment, include:

- The total daily traffic generation for the site based on the RMS Guidelines equates to 4,958 vehicle movements. This generates an AM peak of 561 and PM peak of 603 vehicle movements per hour;
- The RMS Guidelines indicate that 80% of heavy vehicle movements occur outside the standard AM and PM peak periods, between 9am and 4pm, and only up to nine per cent of total daily heavy vehicle movements occurring in the peak periods. Therefore, the anticipated total daily heavy vehicle movements in peak period is 80 vehicle movements;
- The AECOM report modelled a new intersection of Hollinsworth/Richmond Road/Townson Road, which consists of four-way cross intersection that allowed for full vehicle movements in all directions. The modelling found that the intersection would be operating at near capacity during the weekday AM and PM peak periods; and
- SIDRA modelling for all internal access roads in the estate, found in the report prepared by ARUP in 2009, showed that the access roads would operate at a satisfactory level of service or better in 2036.

Based on the above GTA’s report concluded that:

"it is expected that there will be adequate capacity on the broader road network within the industrial precinct, as well as along Richmond Road, to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed estate.

Therefore, the traffic generated from the proposed estate is not expected to compromise the safety or function of the surrounding road network."

Therefore, the expected generated by the proposal on the future road network are considered to be acceptable.
6.4.2. Construction Traffic

The Transport Impact Assessment report prepared by GTA states:

"...considering that the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct was designed to accommodate the expected full development of the site, the volume and composition of traffic during construction could not be expected to compromise the safety or function of the surrounding road network."

The anticipated level of construction vehicles for the proposal would not be at the same level of intensity as those required to develop the entire infrastructure for the Marsden Park Industrial Estate.

6.4.3. Access

Vehicular access to the proposed development is proposed via three entries along Hollinsworth Road on the northern boundary of the site. Each access has a 7.2 to 9.5 metre wide carriageway set within an approximately a 13 metre wide road reserve. Vehicular access points 1, 2 and 3, as identified in Figure 21 benefit from all vehicular movements (left in and out; right in and out).

The proposed access roads will operate at a satisfactory level of service and will be designed to be consistent with the dimensional requirements as set out in Council's DCP and the Australian Standard for Off Street Car Parking and Commercial Vehicle Facilities (AS2890.1:2004, AS2890.2:2002 and AS2890.6:2009).

Figure 21 - Vehicular Access Plan

6.4.4. Parking

The proposed development provides a total of 663 at-grade car parking spaces.

The total amount of car parking spaces required for the proposal as per the Blacktown City Council's Growth Centre precinct Development Control Plan 2016 (DCP) equates to 1,163 spaces. The required number of car spaces as per the DCP has been calculated on the following rates per specific land use:

- Warehouse / light industrial:
  - 1 space per 75 square metres of GFA of floor area up to 7,500 square metres GFA; and
  - 1 space per 200 square metres of GFA of floor area greater than 7,500 square metres GFA.
- Office: 1 space per 40 square metres of GFA.
Notwithstanding the above, the proposal applies the car parking requirements defined by the RMS *Guide to Traffic Generating Development*. The car parking for the relevant land uses set by the RMS Guidelines include:

- Warehouse / light industrial: 1 space per 300 square metres of GFA.
- Office: 1 space per 40 square metres of GFA.

Based on the above RMS parking requirements that the proposal would generate a total of 527 car parking spaces. While the total proposed amount of 663 car parking spaces is less than the DCP required 1,167 spaces, it is much higher than the RMS required number of spaces.

The Transport Impact Assessment Report states that the proposed amount of car parking is adequate for the site for the following reason:

“As such, the proposed car parking supplies across the building sites are considered acceptable for the intended uses given the automated nature of modern warehouse and distribution facilities that are less reliant on floor staff to operate the facilities. Should any of the sites require greater staffing levels, a staggering of shift times would reduce the long-term parking demand, with appropriate management at the time of shift change to reduce the overlap. This should be considered as part of tenants’ staff working structure/policy.”

The proposal satisfies Council’s DCP requirement for accessible car parking spaces. The proposal applies Council’s DCP requirement of 2% of all spaces are to be allocated to accessible parking. The proposal provides a total of 15 accessible spaces.

### 6.4.5. Loading and Circulation

GTAs Transport Impact Assessment and supporting architectural plans identify that each proposed building is provided with a designated loading area. The loading docks within each building are able to accommodate heavy vehicles between 15.2 metres to 19 metres. Detailed swept path analysis of these heavy vehicles is provided in the Transport Impact Assessment found at Appendix G of this report. Large 26 metre B-double vehicles can also be accommodated on the site, the Transport Impact Assessment states:

“Where 26-metre B-double vehicle access is required to a building site, loading/ unloading would occur from the hardstand area. Swept path analyses indicate there is sufficient area within the hardstand areas of most building sites to allow for a B-double vehicle to enter, manoeuvre within the site and exit to the road in a forward direction.”

The proposed loading facilities and manoeuvrability on the site is considered to be more than suitable for the future operation of the site.

### 6.4.6. Summary

- The proposed access arrangement, parking and loading layouts are consistent with the requirements of the DCP 2016 and the Australian Standards.
- The loading dock facilities has been designed to accommodate up to 19 metre articulated vehicles, with 26 metre B-double vehicle access for loading/ unloading within the hardstand area.
- The proposed parking provision meets the RMS rates. The proposed car parking supplies across the site is considered acceptable for the intended uses given the automated nature of modern warehouse and distribution facilities that are less reliant on floor staff to operate the facilities.
- The site is expected to generate up to 603 vehicle movements in the peak hours and 4,958 vehicle movements daily, which is considered to be acceptable.
- The proposed development is consistent with the intended uses for the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct and therefore is not expected to compromise the safety or function of the surrounding road network during the peak periods.

Refer to Appendix H for the Traffic, Parking and Access Assessment Report.
6.5. **SOIL AND WATER**

Costin Roe Consulting Pty Ltd was commissioned by Logos Property to prepare a stormwater management plan and civil stormwater design plans. The report provides a discussion or where necessary an assessment of the site works, the site’s drainage conditions, the stormwater quality management and erosion control measures.

6.5.1. **Site Works**

The key factors considered in Costin Roe’s report for works during the bulk earthworks relate to management of the material after cut and fill, grading of the site and soil erosion and sediment control on the site. The report states that the proposal creates a balance between the cut and fill material volumes, therefore there is no requirement for importation nor exportation of material.

In relation to grading levels they will be subject to detailed design. The proposal includes a sedimentation basin to manage any potential sediment impacts. The proposal is supported by soil erosion and sedimentation management measures which are identified in the Soil and Water Management Plan.

6.5.2. **Stormwater Drainage**

The site is currently subject to three drainage catchments. The catchments are identified as follows:

- First catchment has an area of 12.89 hectares and drains to Hollinsworth Road on the northern side of the property and ultimately to Sydney Business Park Basin E.
- The second catchment, has an area of 2.35 hectares and drains from the site through private property at the north-east corner of the development site and ultimately to the proposed Sydney Business Park Basin E as well.
- The third catchment drains have an area of 1.45 hectares and is located to the east of the site, to an existing basin and ultimately to an existing overland flow path, where it ultimately joins with the remaining 5.29 hectares’ catchment.

Costin Roe’s report provides a detailed discussion on the proposed configuration to enable the suitable drainage to the various catchments. Importantly, the report identifies that the proposed design consists of two type of system, one being a minor system catering for 1 in 20 year ARI storm events and the other a major system, catering for 1 in 100 year ARI storm events.

**Stormwater Quantity Management**

It is understood that stormwater detention is not required for development sites, which drain to the Sydney Business Park Regional Basins when constructed. However, at this stage the relevant regional basins have not been fully built and therefore a temporary detention system is required to attenuate for drainage runf-off.

Stormwater quantity management modelling was based on Intensity/Frequency/Duration (IFD) data that was adopted from Council’s Development Guidelines used in conjunction with rational method calculations to estimate peak flows for the site and surrounding catchments.

The modelling determined that temporary on-site detention is required consisting of, two on-site detention (OSD) tanks to Lot 1, one OSD to Lot 2 and four OSD tanks to cater for the eastern catchment to. It is highlighted that should the Sydney Business Park Regional Basins be fully constructed at the time of detailed design of the proposed development, then these temporary OSD measures will not be required.

Further, as stated in the report, ‘the attenuation volume for the interim detention has been assessed based on attenuating the post development flow to pre-development flow for storms ranging from 1 in 2 year ARI to 1 in 100 year ARI.’ The relevant modelling found that the post-development flows are less than the pre-development flows based on the proposed temporary drainage design.

**Stormwater Quality Controls**

The proposal includes Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) measures and stormwater quality measures in accordance with Council’s requirements. Stormwater Treatment Measures (STMs) have been proposed to ensure that stormwater quality is maintained. The components of the treatment trains are proposed in the relevant stormwater design plans, however these will be subject to confirmation during the detailed design stage of the proposed development. Notwithstanding this, the expected STMs for each building are likely to comprise the following elements:
Primary treatment to parking and hardstand areas is to be performed Stormwater 360 Enviropod Pit Inserts;

Tertiary treatment is to be made via a Stormwater360 Stormfilter System. These may be housed within detention system or their own underground housing tank; and

A portion of the roof will also be treated via rainwater reuse and settlement within the rainwater tank.

MUSIC modelling was used to model water quality based on the selected STMs. The report found that:

“MUSIC modelling has been performed to assess the effectiveness of the selected treatment trains and to ensure that the pollutant retention requirements of Part J of BCC’s DCP2015 have been met.

The MUSIC modelling has shown that the proposed treatment train of SQID’s will provide stormwater treatment which will meet BCC requirements in an effective and economical manner.”

Stormwater Harvesting

Stormwater harvesting refers to the ability of the proposal to collect stormwater that could be used for non-potable purposes. The aim for introducing any stormwater harvesting is to reduce water demand for the development by a minimum of 80% as required by Part J of Council’s DCP. The proposal provides rainwater tanks in order to achieve stormwater harvesting, as described below in Costin Roe’s report:

“In general terms the rainwater harvesting system will be an in-line tank for the collection and storage of rainwater. At times when the rainwater storage tank is full rainwater can pass through the tank and continue to be discharged via gravity into the stormwater drainage system. Rainwater from the storage tank will be pumped for distribution throughout the development in a dedicated non-potable water reticulation system.”

Given the above, the proposal includes a 120kL rainwater tank. MUSIC modelling was used to determine the ability of the proposal rainwater tank to meet Council’s minimum 80% reduction in water demand. The MUSIC modelling found that:

“results summarised in Table 6.4 (of the Costin Roe report), predicts that the requirements of Blacktown Council DCP2015 Part J (80% reduction in non-potable water demand) will be met for the development with the provision of a minimum 120kL rainwater tank.”

Summary

The proposal has been designed to satisfy the relevant requirements in Council’s DCP. Section 7 in the report prepared by Costin Roe provides recommended conditions to deliver and manage the proposed stormwater management design on the site, which also include erosion control conditions. It is recommended that these conditions be adopted.

Refer to Appendix F of this report for the Stormwater Management Report and supporting plans.

6.6. NOISE AND VIBRATION

EMM Consulting Pty Ltd (EMM) was engaged to undertake a noise and vibration impact assessment (NVIA) of the proposal. The NVIA has been prepared with reference to the following noise policies, plans, guidelines and standards:

- Blacktown Development Control Plan 2015;
- NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA), Industrial Noise Policy (EPA 2000);
- NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA), Road Noise Policy (EPA 2011);
- NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change (DECC), Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC 2009); and

EMM carried out noise measurements between 11 August and 21 August 2017. The noise monitoring was conducted at eight locations across the surrounding area, including:

- R1 – Caravan park 140 Hollinsworth Road, Marsden Park;
R2 – Residence 105 Stockholm Avenue, Hassall Grove;
R3 – Residence 85 Stockholm Avenue, Hassall Grove;
R4 – Residence 67B Stockholm Avenue, Hassall Grove;
R5 – Residence 9 Amelia Way, Bidwill;
R6 – Residence 11 Pine Crescent, Bidwill;
R7 – Residence 5 Ramosus Way, Bidwill; and
R8 – Baitul Huda Mosque 45 Hollinsworth Road, Marsden Park.

Figure 22 - Noise Monitoring Locations

In accordance with the NSW EPA’s Industrial Noise Policy (INP), the intrusive noise level criteria for each location where monitoring was conducted, for an L_{Aeq(15min)} would be 42dB (daytime), 40dB (Evening) and 36dB (night time). As identified by EMM, the INP also establishes the noise amenity goals for specific land uses. In the circumstance of the proposal, the acceptable amenity noise level would apply to nearest receivers:

- Caravan park (Location R1) - 70dB (daytime), 70dB (Evening) and 70dB (night time);
- Suburban (Locations R2 - R7) - 55dB (daytime), 45dB (Evening) and 40dB (night time); and
- Places of worship (Location R8) (when in use) - 40dB (daytime), 40dB (Evening) and 40dB (night time).

The report prepared by EMM also discusses the criteria for exposure to continuous vibration and impact to human comfort. The criteria vary depending on location and time of the day, and ranges from 0.14mm/s to 1.1 mm/s.

Based on the monitoring the NVIA found that:

“The modelling results are summarised in Table 5.5. The results show that site noise levels during the day and evening periods are predicted to satisfy the relevant criteria at all assessment locations. During the night period, site noise is predicted to satisfy the relevant criteria at most assessment locations. The exceptions were at R4 and R5, where night-time noise levels are predicted to marginally (by 1 to 2 dB) exceed the relevant criteria during F class temperature inversion conditions or during prevailing adverse winds.”

EMM in their NVIA report concludes that:

- Construction vibration impacts from the project are considered unlikely;
The assessment found that noise from operation of the project is predicted to satisfy INP noise criteria for day, evening and night periods at most assessment locations. At R4 and R5, noise levels are predicted to marginally exceed the criteria during the night period during worst case meteorological conditions. By adopting management measures recommended in this report, these marginal exceedances can be mitigated;

The potential for sleep disturbance from operation of the project during the night period has been assessed. Internal maximum noise levels from the operations are predicted to be below those likely to wake residents. On this basis, sleep disturbance impacts during the night period are unlikely; and

An assessment of cumulative industrial noise from the project with other industrial noise sources in the vicinity was conducted. The project is not predicted to increase industrial noise levels above the relevant amenity criteria.

Detailed recommended management and mitigation measures are provided in Section 7 of this report to further reduce site noise impacts from construction and operation. Refer to Appendix G of this report for the NVIA report.

6.7. HAZARDS AND RISK

Building 5 is proposed to be operated by Valley Fresh which involves the cold storage of produce, ripened and/or fumigated if needed and packaging of produce for distribution. Valley Fresh do not ‘process’ produce. Produce remains as it arrived. Only the way it is packed will change. Valley Fresh require the use of the following chemicals in the ripening and fumigation process:

- 1 x 95kg cylinder of methyl bromide which is used for the fumigation of fresh produce as directed by quarantine. It will be stored in the service area in the rear of the fumigation chamber. This room is locked and appropriate safety signage displayed.
- 3-4 x 30kg cylinders of ethylene gas which is used to ripen the fruit. The gas is stored as part of the ripening system with bollards to protect it. The gas is used in the ripening process. Gas cylinders are locked and appropriate signage is displayed.

Marair have provided a Hazardous and Offensive Development Statement (Appendix V) which confirms that the ‘screening distance’ for 120 kg of class 2.1 (flammable gas) is 14m for “sensitive” locations such as residential land uses. The class 2.1 (ethylene gas) storage at Building 5 will be located 25m from the nearest site boundary so it is well within the limit for sensitive locations.

Therefore, the development is not potentially hazardous on the basis of that material.

The development was also assessed for the transportation hazards related to number of generated traffic movements of hazardous materials entering or leaving the site. Based on the very limited hazardous materials quantities, it is anticipated that the vehicles entering with hazardous materials will be significantly below the numbers of Table 2 (Transportation Screening Thresholds), both from the annual cumulative, peak weekly vehicle movements and tonnage”.

Marair conclude that the proposed development “is below the screening thresholds for what is defined as a hazardous or offensive industry under SEPP 33 and accordingly a preliminary hazardous analysis (PHA) is not required”.

6.8. FLOODING

Costin Roe have confirmed that “the site is not affected by flooding, other than the overland flow” that is currently conveyed through the western side of Lot 23 along an existing gully and through an existing dam prior to discharge from the property to the north”.

The upstream catchment is to be conveyed through the site within a stormwater pipe and dedicated easement to Council, which is currently proposed under a separate approval with Blacktown City Council.

The subdivision and civil DA (DA15/275) requires that the lowest point of any road is at or above the 1% AEP flood level.
6.9. AIR QUALITY

An Air Quality Impact assessment was prepared by Pacific Environment Pty Ltd.

The Air Quality Assessment Report has been prepared with reference to the following documents:

- UK Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) “Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction”; and
- NSW EPA “Approved Methods and Guidance for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW” (Approved Methods).

The assessment has been prepared on the basis of health-based criteria established by the abovementioned Approved Methods guidelines. The Approved Methods criteria nominate a standard unit of micrograms per cubic metre of the relevant pollutant that someone could be exposed to over a certain period of time.

Air quality monitoring at the nearest locations to the site is undertaken at four locations within 14 kilometres to the site. These locations include:

- Vineyard located approximately 7 kilometres north of the subject site, which monitors Particular Matter (PM$_{10}$) and Nitrogen Dioxide (NO$_2$);
- St Marys located about 10 kilometres south east of the site, which monitors PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{10}$, Nitrogen NO$_2$;
- Prospect located about 11 kilometres south east of the site, which monitors all relevant pollutants; and
- Richmond located 14 kilometres from the site, which monitors PM$_{2.5}$, PM$_{10}$, Nitrogen NO$_2$.

Air quality monitoring between 2012 and 2016 at the above locations for PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ pollutants recorded the following annual average readings:

- PM$_{10}$ - Between 13 and 19 micrograms per cubic metre. These readings are lower than the EPA criterion of 25 micrograms per cubic metre; and
- PM$_{2.5}$ - Between 5 and 8 micrograms per cubic metre. The maximum EPA criterion is 8 micrograms per cubic metre.

The report identifies that the main air quality and amenity issues at any construction site are:

- Annoyance due to dust deposition (soiling of surfaces)
- Visible dust plumes / visual amenity
- Elevated PM$_{10}$ concentrations due to dust-generating activities
- Exhaust emissions from diesel-powered construction equipment.

The assessment found that, ‘overall earthworks and construction activities classed as ‘medium risk’ and track-out is considered ‘low risk’.’

The assessment report has also considered the impacts on air quality generated from the operation of the proposed development. The criteria to make the relevant assessment were based on the estimated number of vehicle movements from the proposal and the emissions generated by operations in the loading areas. Modelling of the potential impacts to nearest sensitive receivers was then conducted. The results of the modelling found that

- Annual average NO$_2$ predictions were found to be minor relative to the criterion; and
- Based on this analysis, the potential for the operational phase of the Project to adversely impact local air quality is considered minor.

Detailed recommended management and mitigation measures are provided in Section 7 of this report to further reduce or manage air quality impacts from construction and operation. Refer to Appendix I of this report for the report.
6.10. INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

Landpartners Limited has prepared an Infrastructure Requirement Statement to support the proposed development. Refer to Appendix Q for the Infrastructure Requirement Statement.

The findings and recommendations from the statement are provided in Table 11 below. In summary, the proposal will be supplied with adequate services.

Table 11 – Infrastructure Services Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Water Infrastructure</td>
<td>Water main to be extended along Hollinsworth Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potable water</td>
<td>Extension of sewer main is to be provided from nearest connection about 450m away from the site in the Sydney Business Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Waste water</td>
<td>A Section 73 certificate will be required to be obtained prior to issue of a construction certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sydney Water requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>There is sufficient electrical supply within the Marsden Park Industrial Estate to meet the demand of the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>The Marsden Park Industrial Estate is serviced by NBN.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.11. BUSHFIRE

Blackash Bushfire Consulting Pty Ltd has prepared a Bushfire Assessment Report. The site is identified as ‘bushfire prone land’ for the purposes of Section 146 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and the legislative requirements for building on bushfire prone lands apply to the proposal and site.

The Bushfire Assessment Report states:

‘On 9 September 2015, Blacktown City Council approved (determination number 15-275 at Appendix 2) the development application for:

Subdivision to create 4 Torrens title industrial lots, 1 lot for half road width road construction of Hollinsworth Road, 1 lot for future bus-only link road and associated bulk earth works and drainage infrastructure.

Where a development expectation arises from the zoning of the land to build, rebuild, alter or add to a development(s) in pre-existing subdivisions (as approved by Blacktown City Council 9 September 2015), attempts should be made to find a solution considering the level of risk present. PBP notes that the expectation of development is recognised even though the ability to provide for APZs or access requirements required for development may not be possible (PBP p.42).

Future road development is proposed to the south of the site. We understand that the Outer Sydney Orbital’ road is likely to have a lengthy environmental assessment period and the development of the road is 5 to 10 years away. As such, the assessment has been undertaken based on vegetation surrounding the site remaining.’

The report finds that the proposal meets the aims and objectives of the Planning for Bushfire Protection, prepared by the NSW Rural Fire Service.

The report provides the following recommendations:

• Construction Standard: The proposed development shall be constructed in accordance with the Bushfire Attack Levels identified in Figure 6.
• Asset Protection Zones: At the commencement of building works and in perpetuity, an Asset Protection Zone shall be established and maintained to the site boundaries from the buildings from the south. The APZ shall be established and maintained as an inner protection area as outlined within PBP and the NSW RFS document ‘Standards for Asset Protection Zones’. 

Refer to Appendix J of this report for the Bushfire Assessment Report.

6.12. WASTE MANAGEMENT

Waste Audit and Consultancy Services Pty Ltd (Wast Audit Services) were engaged by Logos Property Group to prepare construction and operation waste management plans to support the proposed development. The waste management plans have been on the basis of three key objectives, which are:

• Reduce waste and recyclables to landfill by assisting staff and visitors of the Warehouse Buildings to segregate appropriate materials that can be recycled; displaying signage to remind and encourage recycling practices; and through placement of recycling and waste bins to reinforce these messages.
• Recover, reuse and recycle generated waste wherever possible.
• Compliance with all relevant codes and policies.

The proposed measures to manage waste on the site are discussed below.


The Construction Waste Management Plan (CWMP) aims to ensure that waste generated from construction of the proposal is managed in an effective, safe and environmentally aware manner. The CWMP establishes the waste management principles to manage the expected waste on the site during construction. Specifically, the CWMP provides a list of types of materials expected to be encountered on the site and the management measures, including either re-use/recycling or disposal method.

Refer to Appendix M for the Construction Waste Management Plan.

6.12.2. Operation Waste Management

The Operation Waste Management Plan (OWMP) identifies that the predominant waste streams that are likely to be generated by the proposal include, cardboard/paper recycling, co-mingled recycling, hard/soft plastic recycling, organic recycling and general waste. The OWMP identifies that the total amount of the waste generated by the operation of the entire facility is estimated as:

• Office waste generation – total 9,288 litres per week
  - General waste – 4,644 litres per week
  - Recycling waste - 4,644 litres per week
• Warehouse waste generation - total 63,650 litres per week
  - General waste – 26,350 litres per week
  - Recycling waste – 35,300 litres per week
  - Organic recycling – 2,000 litres per week

Further the OWMP identifies that the proposal would generate very little liquid waste given the nature of the proposed development. Based on the above, the OWMP assumes that as a minimum the following number of bins is to be provided to each warehouse/office building:

• 1 to 4 x 3.0m$^3$ front lift bins for general waste;
• 1 to 4 x 3.0m$^3$ front lift bins for paper/cardboard recycling;
• 1 to 5 x 240 litre mobile garbage bins for co-mingled recycling; and
• Specifically for Warehouse No.5, 1 to 2 x 1.5m$^3$ front lift bins for organic recycling.

The waste storage and collection areas are to be designed to Building Code of Australia requirements and relevant Australian Standards.
Refer to Appendix N for the Operation Waste Management Plan.

6.13. ABORIGINAL HERITAGE

Logos Property Group commissioned Associates Archaeology & Heritage Pty Ltd to prepare the following reports:

- Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment, 117 Hollinsworth Road, Marsden Park, dated September 2017 (ACHA); and
- Archaeological Report, 117 Hollinsworth Road, Marsden Park, dated September 2017 (ATR).

The reports adhere to the guidelines and codes of practice of the following:

- Office of Environment and Heritage, ‘Guide to investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW’, 2011; and

An Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) application was lodged with the Office of Environment & Heritage in August 2017. However, due to the known archaeological recording and complex history of the area, the above reports must be in conjunction to fully understand the associated issues.

While little is still understood about pre-1788 Aboriginal culture of the Sydney Basin, the ACHA identifies that the study area is generally regarded to be within the range of the Darug people.

In 2009, Kelleher Nightingale undertook the original detailed assessments of the entire Marsden Park Industrial Area. Kelleher Nightingale then undertook a subsequent assessment in 2015. Kelleher Nightingale made four listings within the subject site, which are identified in the figure below as shown in the ACHA.

Figure 23 – Identified Aboriginal Heritage Sites

![Figure 23 – Identified Aboriginal Heritage Sites](source)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHIMS #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45-5-3743</td>
<td>MP11 14</td>
<td>Artifact: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-5-3744</td>
<td>MP11 15</td>
<td>Artifact: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-5-3745</td>
<td>MP11 15A</td>
<td>Artifact: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-5-3746</td>
<td>MP11 16B</td>
<td>Artifact: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment, 117 Hollinsworth Road, Marsden Park, dated September 2017
Archaeological survey of the site found that there were 31 artefacts that were recorded. The survey found that the concentration of the artefacts were consistent with the predictions and findings of the Kelleher Nightingale reports, whereby the artefacts were located on the ridge and hill tops. However, the ACHA states that the artefact density is low across the western side of the study area. The ACHA makes the following observations based on the survey results and context of other datasets, including:

- **The relative density of artefacts in the current study area is diminished when compared to higher density occurrences found elsewhere nearer to water.**

- **The ranking of the ‘South Slope Zone’ decreases in the context of the wider dataset. This is considered to be because the artefacts within in the current study area may be derived from the adjoining ridge and hill top whereas across the wider area, they are more reflective of the low density expected for a landform more than 300m from water.**

- **The low density in the area 100-200m from water in the current study area is relatively increased with the wider dataset that includes slightly more level land that includes a greater proportion that is relatively closer to water.**

- **The artefact density on the ‘East Hill’, while likely to be relatively high, is based on a notably low sample area. It is also noted that the excavation data for that area may also be skewed by sample size – detailed in the report for that property (Brown O., 2015). As a result, the possibility should be allowed that:**
  
  a) Of greatest relevance to the current study area, the ‘East Hill’ may not have artefact density that is as relatively higher than the ‘West Hill’ as current data suggest; and
  
  b) The indication that it has higher relative artefact density to the area ‘0-50m from Water’ may also be misleading. In support of this, when the small sample size for ‘East Hill’ is made up for by combining all ridge and hill top data into more reliable 58,220m² Zone with 1.78% survey coverage, that combined Zone ranks third after the 0-50m and 50-100m Zones as we would more reasonably predict.

Further to the above, the ACHA seeks to confirm the previous heritage listings on the site and determine whether there are any new heritage listings. Based on the previous reporting and current investigation works, Section 3.5 of the ACHA states that:

‘Due to relatively close convergence of the previously listed sites MPIP15 (AHIMS # 45-5-3744; also incorporating MPIP 15A (45-5-3745) and MPIP 15B (45-5-3746) and MPIP 14 (45-5-3743), the results of the current archaeological investigation will not result in changes to those listings. There is therefore only one new site listing. This has been listed as ‘Hollinsworth Industrial IF1’ (AHIMS # 45-5-4894). The new listing applies to the isolated find in the northwest corner of the study area and is relevant to the western half of the study area more generally.’

**Significance Assessment**

The values outlined in the Burra Charter including aesthetic, historic, scientific, and social or spiritual significance, have been applied to assess the heritage significance of the site. A summary of the significance assessment is provided in Table 12 below.

Table 12 – Heritage Significance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>The assessment found that sites known as MPIP 14 and Hollinsworth Industrial IF1 have a ‘Low archaeological significance’. While sites known as MPIP 15, 15A and 15B, have a ‘Moderate archaeological significance’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Aesthetic significance is not considered to be of relevance in this case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Aesthetic significance is not considered to be of relevance in this case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recommendations in the ACHA are also provided in the ATR report prepared by Associates Archaeology & Heritage Pty Ltd. Refer to the mitigation measures related to the findings of the heritage assessment are provided in Section 7 of this report.

6.14. CONTAMINATION

Ground Technologies Pty Ltd (Ground Tech) was engaged to prepare a preliminary geotechnical and environmental investigation of the subject site, dated 17 May 2016. The investigation was undertaken on site on 29 March 2016 and included drilling 13 boreholes and the collection of 21 samples for testing purposes.

All site preparation, civil and subdivision works were approved under DA15/275 (as modified).

The investigation included at Appendix K found that:

- The site appears to have been historically utilized for rural/residential purposes. No market gardening or heavy agriculture was identified within the site during the desktop study. No heavy industrial operations were identified within the site during the desktop study. A search of the NSW EPA Contaminated Land Management record of notices revealed that there were no notices issued to the subject site. No history of dangerous manufacturing utilizing heavy chemicals or metals was documented. No history of heavy chemicals or metals storage was documented.

- Groundwater was not encountered during the course of the investigation

- Boreholes confirmed this profile with the subsurface soils to comprise a medium to high plasticity clay soil extending to a sandstone or shale bedrock at depths of between 0.7-3.2m below existing ground surface levels.

- Minor pockets of site filling were observed during the site walk over. Preliminary testing indicates that the material located at Fill area 1 will need to be excavated and disposed of as Restricted Solid Waste – Asbestos Contaminated Material. This could be downgraded to General Solid Waste – Asbestos Contaminated Material subject to further Toxicity Characteristic Leachate Potential (TCLP) testing. The material located at Fill areas 2 through 4 can be classified as General Solid Waste. This material has the potential to be classified as Excavated Natural Material (ENM) subject to further laboratory analysis.

- Laboratory test results indicate that the soil salinity is predominately moderately saline.

The results of the desk top study and chemical analyses indicate that the site does not present a significant contamination risk to human health or the environment in a ‘Commercial / Industrial’ (‘D’).

Accordingly, the site is suitable for the proposed uses. Refer to Appendix K of this report for the Preliminary Geotechnical and Environmental Investigation report.
7. ENVIRONMENTAL RISK ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The SEARs require an environmental risk analysis to identify potential environmental impacts associated with the proposal.

This analysis comprises a qualitative assessment consistent with AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009 Risk Management–Principles and Guidelines (Standards Australia 2009). The level of risk was assessed by considering the potential impacts of the proposed development prior to application of any mitigation or management measures.

Risk comprises the likelihood of an event occurring and the consequences of that event. For the proposal, the following descriptors were adopted for ‘likelihood’ and ‘consequence’.

Table 13 – Risk Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Almost certain</td>
<td>1 Widespread irreversible impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Likely</td>
<td>2 Extensive but reversible (within 2 years) impact or irreversible local impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Possible</td>
<td>3 Local, acceptable or reversible impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Unlikely</td>
<td>4 Local, reversible, short term (&lt;3 months) impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Rare</td>
<td>5 Local, reversible, short term (&lt;1 month) impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The risk levels for likely and potential impacts were derived using the following risk matrix.

Table 14 – Risk Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSEQUENCE</th>
<th>LIKELIHOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the environmental risk assessment for the proposed development are presented in Table 15 and are based upon the range of technical and specialist consultant reports appended to this EIS.

The table has directly related mitigation measures responding to each impact (satisfying the SEAR for a consolidated summary of all proposed mitigation measures) also based upon the range of technical and specialist consultant reports appended to this EIS.
Table 15 – Risk Assessment and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Proposed Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Impact</strong></td>
<td>Impact on key views of the site from key public places</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Provision of dense landscape screening as per Landscape Drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on key views from nearby residential receivers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Provision of dense landscape screening as per Landscape Drawings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic and Parking</strong></td>
<td>Impacts of road network from construction phase</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>A detailed Construction Management Plan would be prepared for the development prior to issue of the Construction Certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverse impact on key intersections as a result of increased operational traffic generation on the site.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Modelled intersections will continue to operate satisfactorily. The proposed development is consistent with the intended uses for the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional demand for on street car parking spaces.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Not required. Onsite car parking provision is adequate for the proposed use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverse traffic impacts of trucks accessing site via Hollinsworth Road.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not required. The proposed development is consistent with the intended development of the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of internal road designed for truck use.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Not required. Adequate internal circulation is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverse impact on pedestrian movements around and into site.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>The driveways on Hollinsworth Road will be designed and arranged to provide adequate sight lines for pedestrians and as such will alleviate potential safety impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise and Vibration</strong></td>
<td>Impact from construction noise and vibration</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• Restrict construction activities during ICNG standard hours only;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Proposed Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preparation of a construction noise management plan prior to construction to ensure that all employees understand and take responsibility for noise control at site;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular reinforcement (such as at toolbox talks) of the need to minimise noise and vibration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular identification of noisy activities and adoption of improvement techniques;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Schedule construction activities such that the concurrent operation of plant is limited;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Properly maintain plant to ensure rated noise emission levels are not exceeded;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid or minimise the use of portable radios, public address systems or other methods of site communication that may unnecessarily impact upon nearby residents except where required for safety reasons;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop routes within the site for the delivery of materials and parking of vehicles to minimise noise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Where possible, avoid the use of equipment that generates impulsive noise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimise the need for vehicle reversing; eg by arranging for one-way site traffic routes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimise use of broadband audible reverse alarms on vehicles used on site;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimise the unnecessary movement of materials and plant;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Proposed Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule intensive works outside of respite periods; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a contact telephone number via which the public may seek information or make a complaint. A log of complaints should be maintained and actioned by the site superintendent in a responsive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact from operational noise generated on site and sleep disturbance</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>For Building 3, during the night-time period use the eastern loading docks and limit the use of the southern loading docks as far as practicable; Minimise use of broadband audible reverse alarms on heavy vehicles during the night period; Use recessed loading docks where possible during the night period to minimise noise from loading/unloading operations; and Schedule truck movements and loading dock operations such that concurrent operation of vehicles is minimised. This would include limiting onsite vehicle idling while loading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact from mechanical plant equipment</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Mitigation measures to be proposed once detailed design determines plant equipment location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Risk</td>
<td>Impact from the storage of dangerous goods</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not required. The proposed quantities of dangerous goods to be stored at the development do not exceed the threshold quantities listed in Applying SEPP33 (Ref.1). Hence, it is concluded that SEPP33 does not apply to the proposed development and therefore a Preliminary Hazard analysis is not required for the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Proposed Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Dust and emission impacts from earth moving equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare a Dust Management Plan prior to issue of a Construction Certificate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact from vehicle omission</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• Vehicles on the site minimise time spent idling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access arrangement to minimise vehicle queuing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Vehicles will be maintained to operate in a proper and efficient manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushfire</td>
<td>Impact for potential bushfire threat</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>• <strong>Construction Standard</strong>: The proposed development shall be constructed in accordance with the Bushfire Attack Levels identified in Bushfire Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Asset Protection Zones</strong>: At the commencement of building works and in perpetuity, an Asset Protection Zone shall be established and maintained to the site boundaries from the buildings from the south. The APZ shall be established and maintained as an inner protection area as outlined within PBP and the NSW RFS document ‘Standards for Asset Protection Zones’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>Impacts associated with construction waste</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>• Prepare a Workplace Health and Safety Plan as part of the detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Materials are to be stored and handled correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All construction staff to be properly inducted and educated on storing and handling waste materials/products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts associated with operation waste</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>• Materials to be stored and handled correctly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>Potential Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>Proposed Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage</td>
<td>Impact on the Aboriginal cultural heritage values on site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- All staff to be properly inducted and educated on storing and handling waste materials/products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In summary, this involves:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Phase 1 testing comprising six 1x1m units with provisions to dig another two units if no artefacts are found. If no artefacts are found in this initial 8m², excavation should cease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Phase 2 testing comprising the opening up of whichever Phase one unit has the highest number of artefacts to a total of 12m² dug in the direction of highest apparent density. If the overall artefact density is less than 3 artefacts per square metre (&lt;36 artefacts in total), it should be taken as a sufficient threshold of low density to cease excavation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Phase 3: In the event of artefact density of 3/m² or more within the Phase 2 excavation, it should continue to a maximum of 25m². The excavation layout (placement of squares) should continue to work in the direction of highest apparent artefact concentration at the discretion of the excavation director for as long as the overall artefact density remains &gt;3/m². The salvage excavation should then cease.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. SUMMARY AND PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

This EIS is submitted to the DPE for a DA under Part 4 of the EP&A Act. This SSD application seeks approval for the development of an industrial estate, including the construction of seven warehouse buildings with ancillary office space, loading docks, hardstand and circulation areas, internal access roads, car-parking and landscaping works, and service and infrastructure augmentation and additions.

Consistency with Planning Provisions
The proposal is generally consistent with the objectives, provisions and strategies outlined within this EIS, including the EP&A Act, SEPP SRD, the Growth Centres SEPP, A Plan for Growing Sydney, and the Draft District Plan.

Consultation
Consultation has occurred with a range of key stakeholders and agencies during the preparation of this EIS, including the local community, Blacktown City Council, Department of Planning and Environment, Roads and Maritime Services, BusWays, Sydney Business Park and Ingenia Static Homes.

The outcomes of consultation have been incorporated into the proposal through amendments to the design and operation, including the internalised loading docks to reduce operation noise impacts, general compliance with setbacks and the design of the access arrangements.

Site Suitability
The site is considered suitable for the development given the following:

- The site zoning permits all proposed land uses.
- The proposal is consistent with the planned employment generating development outcome for the site, precinct, LGA, district and region.
- Compatibility with surrounding existing and future development and zoning.
- Adequate separation from sensitive land uses including residential.
- Proximity to the regional road network.
- The proposal will not negatively affect the Aboriginal or European heritage or archaeological significance of the site.

Employment Generation
The proposal will contribute to the growth of the industrial sector in the Blacktown LGA, Central City District and the Western Sydney region. The proposed development is expected to generate approximately 150 to 350 jobs during operation. Approximately 500 full time equivalent jobs are anticipated during construction.

Environmental Impacts
Technical consultants practicing in each of the fields identified in the SEARs have been engaged to conduct assessments of the impacts of the proposed development. The consultants have determined the development can be carried out with minimal environmental impacts. No significant impacts will take place as a result of the proposal.

Conclusion
Based on the findings of this EIS, the proposal supports the objectives and growth of the Marsden Park Industrial Precinct, providing employment opportunities and contributing to the growth of warehouse, logistics and light industrial related development in Western Sydney.

The proposal is suitable for the local context and will not result in any significant environmental impact. As such, it is recommended that the proposal be supported by DPE.
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